Three Texts on Madhyamaka

by

Shakya Chokden

(gser mdog paṇchen shākya mchog ldan 1428 - 1507)

THREE TEXTS ON MADHYAMAKA

First Edition 2000
Reprint 2004

ISBN: 81-864-70-26-3

Published by the Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, Dharamsala, H.P. (India), and printed at Indraprastha Press (CBT), Nehru House, 4, Bahadurshah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002

To commemorate
the 60th Enthronement Anniversary
and the 50th Anniversary of
His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama assuming
State Responsibilities

Contents

Publisher's Note

The Library of Tibetan Works & Archives is pleased to publish "Works on Madhyamaka Philosophy of gSer-mdog pan-chen sha-kya mchog-ldan (1428-1507)" translated by Komarovski Iaroslav. The anthology includes three major treatises on Madhyamaka philosophy by the famous writer Sha-kya mchog-ldan: i. The Wish-fulfilling Meru: A Discourse Explaining the Origination of Madhyamaka (dBu-ma'i byung-tshul rnam-par bshad-pa'i gtam yid-bzhin lhun-po), ii. Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning: Entering the Gate to the Essential points of the Two Truth (bDen-pa gnyis-kyi gnas-la 'jug-pa nges-don bdud-rtsi thigs-pa), and iii. Great Ship of Discrimination that sails into the Ocean of definitive meaning: A Treatise Differentiating the Tenets of Prasañgika and Svatântrika Madhyamaka (dBu-ma thal-rang gi grub-mtha'i rnam-par dbye-ba'i bstan-bcos nges-don gyi rgya-mtshor 'jug-pa'i rnam-dpyod kyi gru-chen).

The Wish-fulfilling Meru attempts in presenting in a lucid and concise way the Madhyamaka view including the Tantrik-madhyamaka, and its spread in India and Tibet. Drop of Definitive Meaning, through its brief yet succinct explanation guides us in entering the spheres of definitive meaning by means of understanding the two truth- the conventional truth and the ultimate truth. Great Ship of Discrimination that sails into the Ocean of definitive meaning extensively explains the divergence of Madhyamaka into Svatântrika and Prasañgika Madhyamaka, their philosophical views, and their interpretation of various concepts. In all, this anthology gives a general presentation of Madhyamaka schools and their views according to the great Sakyapa master.

Despite the meticulous and painstaking translation rendered by the translator, readers are requested to refer to the Tibetan originals for minute details and research information. We hope our readers will enjoy reading this classical work on Madhyamaka philosophy.

Publications Department
Library of Tibetan Works & Archives
Dharamsala (H.P.) India

November, 2000

Translator's Note

Over time Tibetan Buddhism has produced many outstanding scholars whose views have been studied and followed until the present time. Within the Sakya tradition, Gorampa Sonam Senge (go ram pa bsod nams seng ge -1429 - 1489) is considered to be the most influential philosopher of the past five centuries by far. Yet during his lifetime Gorampa's influence was closely rivaled by that of Shakya Chokden (gser mdog paṇchen shākya mchog ldan - 1428 - 1507), whose works until recently received little to no attention among modern scholars.

Although the views of Shakya Chokden and Gorampa often differ greatly on many points of Madhyamaka, their contribution was similar in that they both greatly clarified the views of their own tradition through numerous commentaries on Indian and Tibetan treatises, and also through their original treatises and critical texts aimed at the views of Tsongkhapa (tsong kha ba - 1357 - 1419) and his followers, known as Gelukpa.

The lineage of most of Gorampa's works, which are traditionally transmitted orally through reading and explanation, has survived unbroken until the present day. However, the lineage of transmission of Shakya Chokden's works was broken. Shakya Chokden's works commanded a lesser following because many Sakyapas facing the problem of whether to follow Gorampa or Shakya Chokden had chosen to follow the former, since, according to many Sakya scholars, his approach more correctly expresses the views held by Sakya Pandita Kunga Gyaltsen (sa skya Paṇḍita kun dga' rgyal mtshan - 1182 - 1251), supreme authority of Sakya tradition, and other Sakya masters of the past.

"Wish Fulfilling Meru" - a discourse explaining origination of Madhyamaka (dbu ma'i byung tshul rnam par bshad pa'i gtam yid bzhin lhun po) is one of the last texts Shakya Chokden composed during his lifetime. He wrote this text at the age of 74, in 1501, at the request of the Seventh Karmapa Chodrak Gyamtso (ka rma pa chos grags rgya mtsho - 1454 - 1506). At the same time, Shakya Chokden composed *"The Appearance of the Sun Which Pleases All Discriminative Ones" - a discourse on origination of traditions of the chariots of the Sūtra of Valid Cognition with [its] commentaries (tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnams ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gtam du bya ba nyin*

mor byed pa'i snang bas dpyod ldan mtha dag dga bar byed pa), also at the request of the Seventh Karmapa. Both texts were composed in Serdokchen (gser mdog can, or Golden) monastery, which Shakya Chokden had renamed from Zilun (zi lung) when he was 44 years old.

Wish Fulfilling Meru is a concise presentation of Madhyamaka views and history in India and Tibet. The question of differentiating between Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika and the issue of the two truths are raised in it just briefly. To further elucidate Shakya Chokden's understanding of these points, two of his other texts are also translated below. *Great Ship of Discrimination Which Sails into the Ocean of Definitive Meaning (nges don gyi rgya mtshor 'jug pa'i rnam dpyod kyi gru chen)* explores the difference between the two types of Madhyamaka. Shakya Chokden's explanation of this key topic is similar to those offered by other scholars both inside and outside the Sakya tradition, but differs greatly from Gelukpa interpretations. *Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning (nges don bdud rtsi'i thig pa)* presents Shakya Chokden's unique approach to the interpretation of the two truths.

These and other works of Shakya Chokden comprise no less than a reconsideration of many aspects of the Buddhist philosophy, such as the views of the *Five Dharmas of Maitreya (Pañca Maitreyagrantha* - see footnote 28). Most Tibetan scholars since Tsongkhapa's time have treated the three intermediate *Dharmas of Maitreya* and most of Asaṅga's works, such as *Compendium of Knowledge (Abhidharmasamuccaya)* as Cittamātra works and Dignāga and Dharmakīrti's logical treatises as Sautrāntika - Cittamātra texts. As a result, the views expressed by these texts have been generally undervalued. Only the views of Prāsaṅgika (for Geluk) along with the views of Svatāntrika (for the mainstream of the rest of Tibetan Buddhist traditions) are held to be correct and ultimate. Thus, the works of Dharmakīrti, Asaṅga and others tend to be studied merely for the sake of learning logic and various aspects of conventional existence. Their views on the ultimate truth are learned either in order to be abandoned or in order to be preserved within the tradition as if they were exhibits in a museum. As soon as some inconsistency is found, the views themselves and not their interpretation by later scholars are blamed.

Shakya Chokden's approach is completely different. For him the views outlined by Maitreya, Asaṅga, Dharmakīrti, etc. are the views of Yogācāra, which is a subdivision of Madhyamaka and not

synonymous with Cittamātra. Thus, these views are no less valid than the views of Proponents of Entitylessness (another subdivision of Madhyamaka). Furthermore, while the latter views are necessary for severing conceptual superimpositions and gaining a conceptual realization of emptiness, the views of Yogācāra are indispensable for and more fully express a direct realization of the ultimate truth, according to Shakya Chokden. Furthermore, they provide a bridge to the views of Tantric Madhyamaka, to which they stand very close, much closer than the views of Proponents of Entitylessness. Thus, based on his interpretation, the above mentioned texts of Maitreya and others turn out to be of utmost importance.

In this translation, I have attempted to offer as literal a rendering of the original as possible. As much as possible, I reserve my efforts to clarify the meaning to footnotes. These footnotes are not intended to offer a commentary on Shakya Chokden's thought, but merely to eliminate possible confusions regarding the meaning of the root texts. Thus, many explanations that appear in the footnotes are given from the point of view of Shakya Chokden's approach. People familiar with Buddhist thought in general and that of Shakya Chokden in particular can easily skip them.

Certain terms I used in my translation ("primordial mind" for ye shes, jñāna; "false truth" for kun rdzob bden pa, saṃvṛtisatya, etc.) may seem awkward to the readers not acquainted with the views of Shakya Cokden. Nevertheless, they fit well in the context of his works, as will be seen from the works themselves. For example, one will see that for Shakya Chokden, to "exist" means to "exist truly". Any other type of existence will be "false existence", i.e. "non-existence", which exists only for mistaken mind which falsely takes it to be true. Thus, it is "false truth". "Ye shes" cannot be translated as "primordial wisdom" or "exalted wisdom", when it is described by Shakya Chokden as the innate quality of everyone's mind – that of sentient beings as well as Buddhas (note also that Shakya Chokden doesn't accept an existence of Buddha's qualities, Buddha's wisdom innate in the mental streams of ordinary beings). While "primordial wisdom" cannot, for example, be driven by karmas and afflictions into cyclic existence, this is exactly how Shakya Chokden describes jñāna when commenting on "jñāna of dharmadhātu" in his *Abbreviated Madhyamaka Essence (dbu ma'i snying po bsdus pa).*

My translations are intended to offer a basic introduction to Shakya Chokden's unique philosophical views, in the hope of sparking further detailed studies.

In rendering Tibetan names into English, I have aimed at approximating the Tibetan pronunciation of those names. For those names that have come to have a conventional spelling in English, such as 'Tsongkhapa', 'Nyingma', etc., I have adopted the spelling most commonly used, although 'Tsonkhapa', 'Nyinma', etc., would be a more precise representation of their sound in Tibetan.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Robert Allan Miller, Diana Finnegan, Derek Maher and John Groeneveld for their work in editing this translation. Also I wish to thank Don Eisenberg and Alexander Narinyani who helped me to put this work into computer.

Komarovski Iaroslav
January, 2000.

Part One

Wish Fulfilling Meru

Treatise Called "Wish Fulfilling Meru,"-A Discourse Explaining the Origination of Madhyamaka.

Introductory Presentation of Madhyamaka

Om! Let actions towards virtue and goodness be accomplished!
I prostrate to the great luminary of Munindra shining forever
Like the sun in the vastness of a hundred million universes,
Riding a chariot of four fearlessnesses[1]
While never shifting from the sky of the immaculate dharmadhātu[2]!
While the full moon of your compassion
Ceaselessly shines as a protectress at night[3],
To the great earth you bring the day with the youthfulness of the lord of a dozen,[4]
The sun of true meaning. O, protect me forever!

Having thus paid homage I promise to compose the text[5]:

It is only our Teacher, the Completely Perfect Buddha, Unequalled King of Śākyas[6], who covering all three realms[7] with the fan[-like rays] of the white umbrella of the moon disc of his good fame makes countless migrators[8] enjoy great nourishment of benefit and bliss. The extract and essence of his whole precious Doctrine is the widely known "Middle Path." Because of the very fact that its brief presentation was ordered by the lord of enlightened activities of the Supreme Victor [Buddha][9], there is no fault of writing so much of what is to be explained below.

This explanation is divided into three parts: 1) definition of the Middle Path, 2) explanation of the defined term and 3) divisions of the basis of definition[10].

I. Definition of the Middle Path

Definition is: the path which has abandoned the two extremes[11].

II. Explanation of the Defined Term

It has three parts: 1) identification of extremes, 2) identification of the path and 3) establishment of the path as "the middle" after such identification.

A. Identification of Extremes

It has three parts: 1) identification in general, 2) identification in this case and 3) refutation of objections to it.

1. Identification in General

The difference between non-Buddhists and adherents of this Dharma lies in their views which abide in extremes or in the middle, and in their actions which cling towards external or engage in internal[12]. Because of these features the non-Buddhists are supporters of extremities and are outsiders, while Buddhists are proponents of the middle and are insiders.

2. Identification in this Case

Outsiders who accept the existence of "twelve creating individuals"[13], for instance "self," etc., are proponents of eternalism. Those who accept existence of self etc. in this life but do not accept its continuing from a previous life and moving on towards a future life are proponents of nihilism. All non-Buddhist proponents of tenets fall under these two categories. As upholders of extremities or extremes, all are extremists.

In common with lower tenets[14] the Buddhist Middle [Way School] accepts that "I" or "self," etc., grasped entirely by the innate "I"-grasping[15] has never existed at all. Thus, it is free from the extreme of existence. Moreover, since no existent "self" was ever made non-existent by the power of reasoning or another cause of destruction, it is free from the extreme of non-existence as well[16].

Why is "self" non-existent? Because "self" is not found through the five reasonings searching for it as being one with skandhas[17], different from them, etc.[18] The acceptance drawn from such reasoning is common for all Buddhists[19]. Nevertheless the Saṃmitya school explains [selflessness] by applying characteristics of permanence and impermanence[20].

Śrāvaka schools[21] accept to a small extent the way of eliminating the extremes [of the view of] "self of phenomena"[22] in following way. Since any kind of generally characterized phenomena[23] has never existed from the beginning it is free from the extreme of existence. Although existent for mistaken mind it nevertheless is not made non-existent by pure reasoning or another cause. Thus it is also free from extreme of non-existence[24].

Mahāyāna has two schools: Cittamātra and [Madhyamaka, the latter being] the pinnacle of the four tenets. Using as the basis the way of eliminating the two extremes common with Śrāvakas, Cittamātra also eliminates the extreme of existence [by accepting that] with the exception of one's own mind (which is the creator of appearances), no external objects, from [the grossest compounds] to

the finest particles, have ever existed. Since in this elimination of extremes nothing is ever made non-existent by such tools as reasoning, etc., Cittamātra also eliminates the extreme of non-existence. Upon such elimination "the middle" is all paths characterized by these methods of eliminating the two extremes regarding objective phenomena and persons.

Both Proponents of Phenomenal Existence,[25] Cittamātra and Śrāvaka schools, eliminate the two extremes not only during cultivation of the view but also during the practices of the action. So, while accumulating the collection of merit through practices of the action[26], Cittamātra followers do not accept the existence of external objects. Whereas followers of Vaibhāṣika [with Sautrāntika accept that] everything existent is established as substance and do not accept imputedly existent phenomena.

There are two ways of eliminating the two extremes in Madhyamaka school, the pinnacle of the four tenets: that of Yogācāra and that of Proponents of Entitylessness[27].

Since the first accepts that neither objective nor subjective things have ever existed, as it is taught in *Dharmas of Maitreya*[28], the Yogācāra [viewpoint] refutes the extreme of existence. Also since the Yogācāra school accepts that phenomena are not made non-existent either by pure reasoning or by other causes and conditions, it eliminates the extreme of non-existence. Justification for the Yogācāra elimination of both extremes is given as such: accepting that a thing which was previously existent can become non-existent is abiding in the extreme of non-existence [as well as the extreme of existence. For example,] when previously existent wealth is later exhausted, worldly individuals accept that it is non-existent. Thus they abide in extremes of both eternalism and nihilism.

"The middle" in this tradition is that which is free from both extremes of objectivity and subjectivity or [in other words,] self-luminous self-awareness. Since this tradition does not accept any phenomena except dharmadhātu, it is greatly distinguished from Cittamātra[29].

Proponents of Entitylessness eliminate the extreme of existence on the grounds [of their understanding] that all ultimate and conventional objects of knowledge have never existed. They eliminate the extreme of non-existence on the basis that there can be nothing previously existent which was made non-existent either by reasoning or by the knowledge-seeing of āryas[30]. Since nothing has ever existed, they eliminate the extreme of both existence and non-existence. Since

the basis of dependence, "being both," cannot exist, dependent phenomenon, "not being both," also cannot be accepted[31]. If phenomena, which are not dependently established, are accepted, they won't go beyond being truly existent.[32]

It is clear that all the above explained ways of eliminating the extreme of non-existence express the meaning of sūtra extensively quoted by Great Madhyamikas[33]: "Emptiness doesn't make phenomena empty. Phenomena themselves are empty," etc.

3. Refutation of Objections

Later Tibetans[34] say: "Since phenomena exist conventionally, the extreme of non-existence is eliminated. Since they don't exist truly, the extreme of existence is eliminated." This view doesn't accord with authentic words[35] because it indicates an absence of understanding that, at the time of the cultivation of the view, conceptions grasping at existence have to be abandoned. This view overemphasizes conventions as well. Also, if the extreme of being both is not eliminated it will contradict the authentic words, and if it is eliminated it will mean a direct contradiction in the assertions [of these later Tibetan authors][36].

B. Identification of the Path

"But if extremes of existence and non-existence have to be eliminated [in the way used by the Proponents of Entitylessness, there will be no Path whatsoever because] there cannot exist a Path aside from those [extremes]." This is [the speculation of] the Śrāvaka schools, the Cittamātra school and the Yogācāra Madhyamaka school. Each of these schools accepts the respective types of wisdom of meditative equipoise and subsequent attainment left as a remainder after the elimination of the respective types of the two extremes known to its tenets. This is [accepted as] the Middle Path because it is the [negation's] remainder, which doesn't abide in either of the two extremes and opens the opportunity for bringing an individual to the state of liberation.[37]

For the Proponents of Entitylessness, the Middle Path cannot be identified as "such and such" at the time of the identification of their own Madhyamaka view, because at that time there cannot exist any object of knowledge which wouldn't become an extreme. [Such "objects of knowledge" can be anything] accepted by worldly individuals and Proponents of Phenomenal Existence, as abiding in a mutually exclusive way, for example, existent and non-existent, being and not-being, long and short, etc.

C. Establishment of the Path as "The Middle"

So, at the time of engaging in thinking about the [ultimate] mode of abiding, non-affirming negative, which is free from abiding in anything at all, is [later]called "the middle," and the non-abiding of any subjective mind in any object is [later] called "abiding in the "middle." As it is said: "The absence of abiding is abiding..." Also: " Sentient beings utter words such as, "I see the space." Analyse this meaning in the same way as "seeing the space"."

This also has to be preceded by valid cognition produced from pure reasoning known to Prāsaṅgika or Svatāntrika schools[38]. Otherwise, as it is explained by scholar Kamalaśīla, it would not be a tradition of Nāgārjuna.

In Madhyamaka of the pinnacle of all vehicles[39], the Middle Path left as remainder after the elimination of the two extremes is to be experienced only by the primordial mind of self-awareness and is beyond the reach of sounds and concepts. In this tradition the view which is accessed through the severing of superimpositions[40] by listening and thinking and the view experienced through meditation are identified separately, as it is taught in the *Vajrapañjara [- Vajra Tent]* and the *Kālacakra [- Wheel of Time] Tantras*[41].

Discussion of Various Types of Madhyamaka

III. Divisions of the Basis of Definition

There are three parts here: 1) brief presentation of divisions of actual Madhyamaka which is the object expressed [by Madhyamaka texts], 2) extensive explanation of how the pioneering traditions, [recorded in the treatises] which express actual Madhyamaka, originated and 3) conclusion in the way of refutation and establishment related to those topics.

A. Brief Presentation of Divisions

It has three divisions: 1) identification of the nature [of those divisions], 2) showing the sources of authentic words from which they came and 3) showing others' assertions as narrow.

1. The Nature of Divisions

There are identified two types of actual Madhyamaka, the pinnacle of all tenets: Madhyamaka which is not related to analysis and is experienced [only] through meditation, and Madhyamaka related to analysis and accessed by severing superimpositions of grasping at signs.

Synonyms of the first type are known as: vajra of ultimate bodhicitta[42], element of Sugata[43]'s essence, object of function of self-aware primordial mind, one to be experienced by wisdom produced from meditation, primordial mind of dharmadhātu, emptiness endowed with the most supreme of all aspects, etc.

Synonyms of the second type are: emptiness related to severing superimpositions by listening and thinking, emptiness related to searching for and not finding terminologically imputed meanings, emptiness which is beyond objects of mind, emptiness which is non-affirming negative, emptiness in which the skandhas are severed, etc.

2. The Sources of Divisions

The first set of synonyms is taught in the words of Sūtras of the Third Dharmacakra[44] and Tantras which are the pinnacle of all Vehicles. The second set of synonyms is taught primarily in the explicit teachings of *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras*[45] known as the Words of the Second Dharmacakra. It is also taught extensively in many other Sūtras.

3. Showing Others' Assertions as Narrow

Some Madhyamikas say that the emptiness which is non-affirming negative is not Madhyamaka. As the source [for their view] they cite the scripture: "Emptiness in which skandhas are severed is essenceless like a plantain tree." Some say that the first ones are not Madhyamikas, quoting as the proof : "... since it does not withstand forces of analysis it is false." Nevertheless both approaches[46] are taught in authentic scriptural sources, and for them to be the basis of limitless positive qualities, the first one is indispensable. Also, if the first type of emptiness[47] is accepted to be the false truth[48], it will follow that it is phenomenon polluted by ignorance[49]. On the other hand, if emptiness which is non-affirming negative is not established by reasons explained in the *Collection of Reasoning*[50], it will be difficult to abandon conceptual minds grasping at signs. As it is said: "When suchness is not known, thoughts fancying saṃsāra and nirvāṇa arise. If suchness is seen, there are no thoughts fancying saṃsāra and nirvāṇa." Here, the first Madhyamaka approach removes the extreme of underestimation and the second approach removes the extreme of overestimation.

When this [viewpoint of] Madhyamaka is understood, other divisions of Madhyamaka can also be presented in the following way: the Madhyamaka whose approach is based on the entitylessness of all phenomena, the Madhyamaka in whose approach thoroughly established phenomena[51] are proclaimed as entity, and Madhyamaka of the Supreme Secret Mantra. The first is the *Collection of Reasoning* (*rigs tshogs lnga*) with [the commentaries of] its followers. The second is the *Dharmas of Maitreya* with [tne commentaries of] their followers. The last one is shown by names of "Union of Hevajra"[- Pleased Vajra], "Cakrasaṁvara"[- Wheel of Supreme Bliss][52], etc. It will be explained below.

The Origination of Madhyamaka in India

B. Extensive Explanation

Extensive explanation of how the pioneering traditions of charioteers originated has three divisions: 1) how Madhyamaka treatises were composed in the Land of Āryas [- India], 2) how they came to the Snow Land [- Tibet] and 3) showing disadvantages of attachment to partial Madhyamaka.

1. How Madhyamaka Treatises were Composed

This section also has three divisions: 1) brief explanation by showing that the Glorious Saraha pioneered the tradition of Madhyamaka, 2) extensive explanation by showing how it was pioneered by two great charioteers and 3) showing the indispensability of explaining Tantric Madhyamaka separately.

i. How Glorious Saraha Pioneered Madhyamaka

As it was said: "Four hundred years after my nirvāṇa ..." etc.[53], it is generally accepted that initially the tradition of Madhyamaka treatises was pioneered by the Protector Nāgārjuna. Nevertheless, besides him, a short time before, the Great Brahmin, the Glorious Saraha[54], in a form of singing a song, composed a Madhyamaka treatise whose topic was the mind-vajra free from [conceptual] analysis. The account of his lineage holders and the pioneers [of his tradition] who came after him is clarified elsewhere, so I don't have to write it here.

Madhyamaka, as explained in that treatise, is identified in the following words: "Only mind itself is the seed of everything. I prostrate to the mind from which saṃsāra and nirvāṇa emanate, which is like a wish-fulfilling gem that grants the accomplishment of desires"[55]. It has the same meaning as the following quotation [from *Abhidharmasūtra*] used by Ārya Asaṅga[56] as the proof of mere basis of all[57] and the element of Sugata essence: "The sphere from beginningless time – it is the place of all phenomena. Since it exists, all migrations and the attainment of nirvāṇa as well are possible." Its meaning is that very beginningless mind which is luminous by nature. It is called "primordial mind of dharmadhātu at the time of the basis." Its synonyms are given as: causal tantra, element, sphere, source, and element of both sentient beings and Buddhas.

The way of it[s being source etc.] is detailed in the following: That [state in which] saṃsāric potentials are accumulated and ripened on this luminous mind, and which is suitable for separation from this clear light[58] nature is called consciousness- the basis of all. Since it belongs to saṃsāra it is not appropriate for it to be Madhyamaka. Again, that state in which potentials of nirvāṇa are accumulated on this luminous [mind], and which is not suitable for separation from this clear light, is described by such names as primordial mind – the basis of all, natural dharmakaya[59], Buddha essence, and "sentient beings are buddhas."

Logicians whose lineage comes from the Great Translator Nok [Loden Sherap – rngog blo ldan shes rab - 1059 - 1109] explain [this nature] as that very non-affirming negation of the conceptualization of stained mind. Nevertheless, if the above quote is the one described by the words of the *Sublime Continuum*: "... are Buddhas," it will not fit together with the three explicit teachings of the treatise[60].

There were other Tibetans who said that among the two ways of interpreting the *Dharmas of Maitreya* - as meditative tradition and dialectical tradition – translator Nok [approached them from the point of view of] the dialectical tradition having "sealed" them with the *Collection of Reasoning*.

ii. How Madhyamaka was Pioneered by the Two Great Charioteers

This section has three parts: 1) tradition pioneered by Nāgārjuna with his followers, 2) tradition pioneered by Asaṅga with his brother [Vasubandhu] and 3) tradition treating these two as concordant.

a. How the Tradition Pioneered by Nāgārjuna and his Followers Appeared in the Land of Āryas

As it is said: " Having the very place of the origin of all faults been abandoned, listen to that reasoning by which existence is also abandoned..." It is explained that "the Protector Nāgārjuna three times roared with a lion's roar on the earth." It is well known that "first Nāgārjuna composed the treatises of the *Collection of Discourses* (gtam tshog)[61] which primarily explain the side of the extensive deeds; next he composed the treatises of the *Collection of Reasoning* which primarily explain the dharma of the profound view as the emptiness related to severing superimpositions by listening and thinking; and finally he composed *Bodhicitta Commentaries, Praise to the Mind Vajra*[62], etc., which primarily explain emptiness which is experienced through meditation."

Āryadeva, holding the traditions of [all] of these with equal emphasis[63], became his main holy son[64]. He composed many treatises: *Four Hundred*, etc.

It is known that the holder of his tradition, the Fearless Dharmapāla, composed treatises explaining the intents of the abovementioned father and son as the Mere Knowing [view][65]. He did this in accordance with the way of interpreting the intent of the Second Dharmacakra by the means of the Third Dharmacakra, as it appears in the Sūtras [of the Third Dharmacakra] themselves. It is known that the Proponents of Entitylessness, hinting [at what they saw as faults of such interpretation], explained: "If, in spite of having distinguished the two truths, great charioteers were deluded, there is no need even to mention others," etc. The meaning of these words is as follows: "False truth has to be explained in accordance with worldly conventions. That is Madhyamaka tradition. But you, [Dharmapāla,] explained it as mere knowing. That which is temporarily explained as ultimate truth, finally also has to be explained as conventional truth, since it does not withstand analysis [using ultimate] reasoning. But you always explain [ultimate truth] as mere knowing. This is a mistake."

Which of these two opinions accords with the way of positing the definitive meaning in Vajrayāna will be analysed below.

The disciples of Nāgārjuna who came next are known as Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka. They agree in classifying the *Collection of Reasoning* explanatory style as that of the tradition of the Proponents of Entitylessness only. On that level, they agree in explaining that "all objects of knowledge are empty of their own nature."

[There are two types of] nature. Pillar being empty of pillar means pillar being empty of false nature. Emptiness of that [false nature] is temporarily posited as ultimate nature. But if this [emptiness] is also analyzed by [ultimate] reasoning it [will be found to] be empty of itself. Thus pillar is empty of its ultimate nature as well. In such a way, since both natures are not seen in pillar, it also does not exist. But then it is not accepted as non-existent either, because "existence," basis of dependence [of "non-existent"], is not accepted.

Interpretation applying such a method to all objects of knowledge is the common tradition of [all] Proponents of Entitylessness. As their source they use the following words: "If non-empty were a little existent, empty would also become a little existent"[66], and "One phenomenon is the nature of all phenomena."

Those teachers, who composed [the Madhyamaka] commentaries, arrive at the same identification of the meaning of emptiness, the object to be determined. But their way of determining [emptiness] is different. The difference is as follows.

First, when the master Buddhapālita was commenting on the meaning of "Neither from self nor from other..."[67], he wrote: "It is said that phenomena which exist in their nature also don't need production: If something exists yet gets produced, it will be never produced," etc. The master Bhāvaviveka wrote the following refutation of this [line of reasoning]: "It is not correct because [a] the reason and example are not stated, [b] the fault of what others have said is not eliminated, and [c] since [these] are the words of the consequence, by reversing the given meaning, the reversed meaning of a probandum and its predicate becomes clear, and thus phenomena will turn to be produced from other and contradiction with [your] tenets will arise."

The meaning of it is following: "Is the reasoning, with which Buddhapālita was refuting the Saṁkhyas[68], used as autonomous reason or consequence? If it is the first, then there is the fault of proof and example being the same[69]. If it is the second,[it is also faulty:] Consequence which does not imply autonomous [reason] cannot produce inferential understanding. If it implies that [reason], then production [must be] accepted as reversed meaning [of the consequence][70]. Thus it will become production in the frame of [ultimate] reasoning. Then it will contradict [Madhyamaka] tenets."[71]

Everybody who holds explanatory lineage of this master in that way is known as Autonomous [- Svatāntrika] Madhyamika. This school also has two traditions: one which comes from Śrī Gupta, Jñānagarbha, etc., and one which comes from the Bodhisattva Śāntarakṣita and his [spiritual] son. They are called Sautrāntika Madhyamaka and Yogācāra Madhyamaka respectively in the *Notes on the View (lta ba'i brjed byang)* composed by the Great Translator Yeshe De (lo tsā ba chen po ye she sde).

The main treatises composed by these teachers are: the root text and the auto-commentary of *Engaging in Two Truths* (Tib.: *bden pa gnyis la 'jug pa)* by Jñānagarbha[72], the root text and the auto-commentary of *Madhyamaka Ornament* (Tib.: *dbu ma rgyan*) by the Bodhisattva Śāntarakṣita, and the treatise of *Madhyamka Vision* (Tib.: *dbu ma snang ba*) by his disciple Kamalaśīla. These texts are known as the *Three Madhyamaka Treatises of Eastern Svatāntrikas (rang rgyud shar pa'i dbu ma'i bstan bcos rnam pa gsum*). They were translated and

[their meaning was] determined at the earlier time of the Dharma king Trison Deutsen (chos rgyal khri srong lde'u btsan - 742 – 796). The Great Translator Nok composed many commentaries of abbreviated meaning and word meaning on those treatises; the explanatory lineage of those [commentaries] survived unbroken up to the present time. It has yet to be determined whether the Great Translator received [teachings on these treatises] in India or from his uncle[73].

One of the followers of Śāntarakṣita is the master Haribhadra. Everybody in the Land of Snows agrees that he interpreted the meaning of the *Mother [Prajñāpāramita]* according to the Yogācāra [Madhyamaka] tradition. Thus, in his method of refutation of grasping at signs he used the reasoning of the Proponents of Entitylessness, while he explained the object of meditative experience from the point of view of Yogācāra.

Similarly, the Great Translator commented that Śāntarakṣita and his son had taught that the intent of the author of the *Commentary on Valid Cognition*[74] is as follows: in order to sever superimpositions, use syllogism of separation from one and many, etc.[75], which proves "the emptiness of oneself', while in order to explain the object of meditative experience, do so from the point of view of "the emptiness of other"[76]. The Great Translator himself also explained the intent of the *Commentary on Valid Cognition* in the same way.

The Lord of Reasoning Chapa (phya pa chos kyi seng ge – 1109 – 1169) taught that the Sautrāntika and Cittamātra traditions temporarily presented in the Seven Pramāṇa texts are not suitable to express the real intent of the author of the *Commentary on Valid Cognition*. Rather his approach was to determine [both the ultimate truth] and the object of meditative experience only as emptiness which is non-affirming negative.

This is just a brief account of the explanatory approach of Svatāntrika Madhyamaka.

It is known that the beginning of the explanatory tradition of what is commonly known as Prāsaṅgika is dated from the time when the Glorious Candrakīrti introduced a rebuttal to the faults ascribed to Buddhapālita by Bhāvaviveka. Buddhapālita's assertion lays in consequence, which Bhāvaviveka failed to grasp [properly]. Candra's explanation of the points which Bhavya didn't understand is as follows:

If a person is a Madhyamaka follower, he does not make a refutation with autonomous proofs for one's own statements, neither

does he create consequences which imply a reversed meaning for an opponent's statements, because, while one engages in pondering the ultimate mode of abiding there is no acceptance of one's statements [whatsoever], and if there is such an acceptance one will fall into the extremes of conceptual elaborations. So, the reasonings refuting Buddhist and non-Buddhist extremists are: "inferential cognition known to others," "consequence revealing contradictions," "equalizing by similar reasons" and "non-establishment due to the similarity of the proof and thesis"[77]. With these reasonings it is enough just to refute in one's mind the assertions of an opponent's statements and thus one does not have to generate the inferential valid cognition ascertaining one's own statements.

Regarding these explanations, later Svatāntrika teachers taught that Bhāvya's approach cannot be undermined by [ascribing to it] the fault of illusion established through [ultimate] reasoning, because when the object of negation, a mass of conceptualization, is negated, its opposite, the absence of conceptualisation, is also negated.[78]

Thus, both Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika [arrive at] non-affirming negation of all mass of conceptualisation. No difference is accepted in that negation. Later Tibetans explain the difference between Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika in another way and thus deviate [from correct explanation][79].

b. How the Tradition Pioneered by Asaṅga and his Brother Appeared in the Land of Āryas.

Buddha said[80]: "Nine hundred years after my nirvāṇa [there will come] a fully ordained monk named Asaṅga. He will be adept in the meaning of the treatise[81] and will perfectly differentiate many aspects of the interpretive and definitive meanings of the Sūtras." Thus, Asaṅga was prophesied [by Buddha] to correctly differentiate the interpretive and definitive meanings. He accomplished the samadhi of the Stream of Dharma[82] and went to Tuṣitā[83]. There he listened at length to Maitreya's *Five Dharmas* and *Great Grounds of Yogic Activities (Yogacāryabhūmi)*, and having written them down as treatises, he brought them to the Land of Āryas.

His younger brother Vasubandhu learned them from Asaṅga and, once he had composed their commentaries known as *Eight Divisions*[84], illuminated the Madhyamaka of the definitive meaning of the ocean-like Yogācāra scriptures. What is that [definitive meaning]? It is the one explained by Āryadeva in the following words: "primordial mind free from grasped and grasper exists as ultimate

meaning. Those who crossed the ocean of Yogācāra scriptures have thus proclaimed."

One may ask: "Is it definite that this very meaning is the intent of all *Maitreya Dharmas*?"

Concerning this question some of the later Tibetans say that all of the *Five Dharmas* are definitely Cittamātra [treatises]. Others say that all of them are definitely Madhyamaka [works]. In these resent times it is unanimously agreed that certainly the first and the last *Dharmas* are Madhyamaka [works] while the tree intermediate ones are those of Cittamātra[85]. Nevertheless I accept that [from looking at] the explanatory style of the scriptures themselves it is proved by direct cognition that [along with the middle three] both the first and last of Maitreya's scriptures make their main topic the Madhyamaka [which is taught in] the interpretation of intent of the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras* by the Third Dharmacakra[86]:

The main topic of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* is known as the hidden meaning of the eight clear realizations and the seventy topics which explain them[87]. The hidden meaning of the clear realizations is identified from the point of view of primordial mind free from grasped and grasper. When discordant factors—objects of yogic abandonment—are identified, they are explained as nothing but conceptions of grasped and grasper, definite in number. Their opposite is explained as primordial mind free from manifested [conceptions of] grasped and grasper: "...has and [thus] relies on the four conceptions.[88]" Its explanation is: "because of non-abiding in form, etc.," ([it is] free from grasped), and: "because of having ceased application related to that," ([it is] free from grasper)[89].

The aspect of consciousness itself is taught to be an object of practical experience: " The particulars of the knowledge of the bases are called "aspects." This is the definition"[90]. This [statement] has to refer to all [practices of the Path] beginning with the Path of Preparation up to [and including] the primordial mind at the end of continuity, since it is said: "As a dream and its dreamer are not seen dualistically, likewise non-existence of dualism of phenomena is realized by one moment [of wisdom]"[91].

The words of seventy topics, which explain [the eight clear realisations], definitely establish all phenomena as "the emptiness of oneself" in exact accordance with the explicit teachings of the *Mother [Prajñāpāramita] Sūtras*[92].

Similarly, when in the treatise of the *Sublime Continuum* identification of emptiness and essence is given, it is said: "The

element is empty of adventitious [phenomena] but it is not empty of sublime phenomena," and: "Perfect limit is completely empty of compounded phenomena." Thus both the way of negating the objects of negation and the identification of the objects of practical experience are clearly explained from the point of view of "the emptiness of other."

Not only that, but if the view of the three intermediate *Dharmas of Maitreya* belongs to Mind Only, then all presentations of the Five Paths, the Ten Grounds[93] and the Resultant Buddha Ground explained in those [three treatises automatically] will have to be underestimated as not conforming to reality.

Through this reasoning it is proved that all Mahāyāna scriptures composed by Asaṅga with his brother, and all texts composed by Dignāga and his [spiritual] son [Dharmakīrti] are the very Madhyamaka of definitive meaning, and they conform to the interpretation of the intent of the *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras* by the Sūtras of Perfect Differentiation[94].

c. The Way of Interpreting [the Traditions of] the Two Pioneers as Non-Contradictory.

The distinguished scholar Śāntipa promised to compose [the text] in his treatise called the *Madhyamaka Ornament (Tib.: dbu ma'i rgyan)* in the following way: "Herein I will explain the two truths proven in valid scriptural statements that were taught by Maitreya and Asaṅga and accepted by Nāgārjuna." One might ask: "Are both traditions identical in explaining as the definitive meaning only that emptiness which is taught by the *Collection of Madhyamaka Reasoning*?

No. However, Nāgārjuna explained the mind-vajra as the definitive meaning, which is where [both traditions] come to the same point.

Others say: "This view of Śāntipa is just his own wishful thinking. How is it possible to blend together the views of Madhyamaka and Cittamātra?"

But then one denigrates the view of Śāntarakṣita with his [spiritual] son [Kamalaśīla], Haribhadra and others known as Yogācāra Madhyamikas. And you actually do denigrate it because you describe everybody who accepts direct apperception as the Proponent of Phenomenal Existence[95].

iii. Showing the Indispensability of Explaining Tantric Madhyamaka Separately.

It has three parts: 1) brief presentation, 2) little bit more extensive explanation and 3) refutation of objections.

a. Brief Presentation

Let me give just a partial illustration of those scriptures which clearly teach Tantric Madhyamaka as distinguished from the above explained approaches of Prajñāpāramita Madhyamaka[96].

In the *Hevajra [Tantra]* it is said: "Madhyamaka is to be taught after Yogācāra. Having learned all the stages of Mantra one is to be taught Hevajra afterwards." On this level of explaining the gradual engagement in the view, primordial mind free from the dualism of grasped and grasper is presented first, followed by the view of non-affirming negation which is "the emptiness of a self-nature" of all phenomena, finally, the view of the union of non-observing compassion and emptiness [is stated][97].

Others say that the first is the Cittamātra view and the last is nothing other than the view of the *Collection of Reasoning*. If this is so, then the following question arises: "Does Asaṅga with his brother not identify "Madhyamaka" as any of the four tenets or does he identify it as such?" If he does not identify it as such, then expressions like "There is no fourth buddhahood and fifth intent of Muni"[98]; and "The Distinction between the Middle and Extremes" from Maitreya's words would have to be rejected[99]. If you say that he accepts it as the view of Proponents of Entitylessness, this also would be wrong, because in [Asaṅga's] *Compendium of Knowledge* proponents of such a view are described as proponents of nihilism (while Candra taught[100] that Vasubandhu etc. didn't understand the view of Adherents of Entitylessness)[101]. Whether you describe [the view of] *the Hevajra* as not being the view of Mantrayāna [at all] or accept it as being such a view, but not being different from the view of Entitylessness, it does not conform to the [Tantric] tradition: [On one hand] it means that you [Tsongkhapa] fail to identify the view of Completion Stage[102]. [On another hand] Adherents of Entitylessness [simply] don't have what you accept as "realization of objective emptiness by subjective great bliss"[103].

b. More Extensive Explanation

Limitless are treatises which clearly present Tantric Madhyamaka: *the Three Cycles of the Bodhisattvas' Commentaries* (Tib.: *byang chub sems*

dpa'i 'grel ba skor gsum), Guhyāsamaja and *Cakrasaṃvara's Five Stages* (Tib.: *rim pa lnga)*, etc.,*Vajra Lines of Path and Result* (Tib.: *lam'bras rdo rje'i tshig rkang), Drop of Liberation* (Tib.: *grol ba'i thig le)*, etc. I will give just a partial illustration [of their view]: The *Bodhisattvas' Commentaries*[104] explain the emptiness endowed with the most supreme of all aspects as the main object to be realized by direct yogic perception. If it is taken to have the same meaning as the emptiness of Adherents of Entitylessness, that will lead to extreme conclusions, such as: It will become an object realized by the mind of listening and thinking, it will be suitable for it to be an object of conceptualization and it will be possible to take it into practice without resorting to empowerment which brings about ripening [necessary for entering Tantric Path][105].

So, what is the need for verbosity? It is definite that "the ultimate name of the Ārya Mañjuśrī," given in *Perfect Expression of Names of Ārya Mañjuśrī* [*Mañjuśrīnāmasaṅgīti*], being primordial mind free from all extremes of conceptualization is the Madhyamaka. As followers of Pāramitayāna[106] lack this [primordial mind], this is unique feature of Tantric Madhyamaka.

c. Refutation of Objections

One may ask: "If one accepts that there is some Tantric Madhyamaka not known to the followers of Pāramitayāna, will it not contradict the words of the Indian master Jñānavajra: "In Mantrayāna there is no view which surpasses total non-abiding. If there were such a view, it would be conceptualized and its teacher would be deluded," and Sakya [Pandita Kunga Gyaltsen]'s: "If there were a view superior to the Pāramita[yāna's view of] freedom from conceptual elaborations, that view would be conceptualized"? Not only that. [If such a difference in the views of Sūtras and Tantras exists,] it will follow that there must be obscuration which cannot be abandoned by primordial mind at the end of the continuum[107], explained in Pāramita[yāna], which directly realizes freedom from elaborations. If one accepts that, then the buddhahood attained by Pāramitayāna will not be sufficient."

It is clear that [all] such explanations [of Jñānavajra, etc.,] are given from the perspective of the view which [merely] severs superimpositions. Otherwise, they will contradict the words of Sahajavajra's commentary on Maitrīpa's *Ten Stanzas on Suchness* (Tib.: *de kho na nyid bcu pa)*: "Madhyamaka called "thorough non-abiding" [but] not ornamented with the guru's instructions is also just

mediocre." Also Sakya Pandita [himself] said: "So, the view of listening understood through explanation is the same."[108] [Thus, he] explained that [view as the one] established by listening and thinking, not as the object of practical experience. Similar to that, when in the *Torch of Three Modes* (Tib.: *tshul gsum sgron me)* the view etc., realized by both Sūtras and Tantras, are explained as the same (: "Although the meaning is the same, there is no delusion..."[109]), it also either accords with the previous way of explaining, otherwise the intention of [that scripture] is [to show that] the explanations given in Tantra and Maitreya's scriptures [refer to] the same object of the view, which is experienced through meditation [only].

Similarly, having temporarily left without consideration the question about whether there are obscurations which cannot be uprooted by the uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum[110], [I should say that] manifestation of buddhahood by an ordinary being in one life is not only an exclusive feature of Tantric skillful means, but also it depends on [the view of] the Tantric Madhyamaka. If the view of the Pāramitas were able to bring about the same [accomplishment], it would clearly [cause] the fault of manifesting perfect limit at the wrong time, and [due to] that fault, one will also fall into nihilistic nirvāṇa[111].

In brief, the definition of this Tantric Madhyamaka is what is called "E-Wam." Also, this is the basis of the discussions in all Tantras, and the way to manifest that [state] is the four empowerments. In *Hevajra* it is said: "The aspect of E-Wam, the great bliss, is to be perfectly known from empowerment." Also, it is not realized by the mind of listening and thinking only: "Inexpressible by others, the simultaneously born one is not found anywhere. It [the simultaneously born one] is known at the time of the guru['s instructions], the presentation of the method, and due to one's own virtuous qualities." Also: "In non-conceptualized nature, deities and mantras abide." Thus, only simultaneously born primordial mind is taught to be the basis of accomplishing the deities and mantras.

At the beginning of different "methods of accomplishment"[112], when the collection of wisdom is being accumulated, two ways of meditation on emptiness are taught: instantaneous recollection by such a mantra as "svabhava" and bringing about recognition [of phenomena] as empty through analysis by reasoning. The first one is the recollection of that emptiness which is the basis of accomplishing the deities, mantras, etc. The second is taught from the point of view of eliminating conceptualization.

Also, the way of eliminating the two extremes by the two Madhyamakas known in the Tantras and Pāramitas[113] is not the same. That which is called "E" eliminates the extreme of overestimation. It is emptiness. And what is this [emptiness]? It has a form similar to reflection, and it is not a non-affirming negative. That which is called "Wam" eliminates the extreme of non-existence. It is great bliss. These two are called "non-observing compassion," because the subject, great bliss, doesn't observe the object, emptiness, as signs. They are called "oneness of knowledge and knowable" because of their being the union free from [existing] as two [different] substances.

In the Madhyamaka of the Pāramitas extremes of existence, non-existence, etc., are refuted in the *objects*, and [thus] explanation [of reality] is given: "If things exist, conceptions arise..." In Tantra from the very beginning *grasping* at existence and non-existence, etc., is ceased and [that is] identified as freedom from conceptuality. Thus, [the view] is explained from the perspective of objective freedom from conceptualization [in the Sūtras] and subjective freedom from conceptualization [in the Tantras].This also is the difference in the mode of explaining freedom from conceptuality in the two traditions.

The Spreading of Madhyamaka in Tibet

2. How Madhyamaka Treatises Came to Tibet

The spreading [of the Madhyamaka treatises] in the Tibetan land has three divisions: 1) how the Madhyamaka of Nāgārjuna [and his spiritual] sons came [to Tibet], 2) how the Madhyamaka of the followers of the *Dharmas of Maitreya* came [to Tibet] and 3) how Tantric Madhyamaka came [to Tibet].

i. The Spreading of the Madhyamaka of Nāgārjuna [and his Spiritual] Sons in Tibet

This section also has three parts: 1) the spreading of the Svatāntrika scriptures, 2) the spreading of the Prāsaṅgika scriptures and 3) how acceptance and rejection of these two came into being.

a. How Svatāntrika Came to Tibet

It is clear that at the earlier time of the Dharma king [Trison Deutsen], when *the Three[Madhyamaka] treatises of the Eastern Svatāntrikas* were translated, just a brief explanatory [tradition of those texts] emerged. But [the person, who] extremely clearly determined [them] through listening and explaining, was [Nok Loden Sherap]: "Beyond the eastern sea, then at the edge of waste lands, [there will come] an Intelligent One [-Loden], different from Lohita. [In] his name, Wisdom [-Sherap] is at the end. In the North, the Snow Land likewise..." That great being, prophesied by [this] and other [Sūtras], greatly clarified [Svatāntrika] through many commentaries. Among many holders of his explanatory tradition, the main one was Khyun Rinchen Drak (khyung rinchen grags). Among his disciples, known as Gyamar Janchup Drakpa (rgya mar byang chub grags pa), Ganpa Sheu (gangs pa she'u),etc.,Drolunpa Lodro Junne (gro lungs pa blo gros 'byung gnas) was the holder of the tradition of all the excellent words of that great individual. Chapa Chokyi Senge studied with both that [Drolunpa] and Gyamarpa. He composed many commentaries on the excellent words in general, and many on *the Three [Treatises of] the Eastern Svatāntrikas* in particular. The words of explanations of the *Dharmas of Maitreya* and Madhyamaka by that teacher came down to Tsek Wanchuk Senge (brtsegs dbang phyug seng ge). From him, they were received by Sakya Pandita, by whom they were passed down to Uyukpa ('u yug pa) who passed them to Shan Dodepa

(zhang mdo sde pa) and others. From him they were passed down to the Lord of Dharma, Holy Lama (or Lama Dampa Sonam Gyaltsen – bla ma dam pa bsod nams rgyal mtshan - 1312 – 1375), and then - to Rinpoche Yakpa (rin po che gyag pa, or Yakde Penchen – gyag sde paṇchen – 1348 – 1414).

b. How the Madhyamaka Known as Prāsaṅgika Came to Tibet

[Atīśa] said: "The disciple of Nāgārjuna['s lineage] is Candrakīrti. With instructions passed down from him, the truth of dharmata is realized." Thus, although at the time when Jowo Atīśa (Tib.: jo bo a ti sha 982 – 1054) came to Tibet, the scriptures of Candrakīrti himself were not actually translated, [Atīśa] composed separate small treatises, such as *the Thorough Distinction of the Two Truths* (Tib.: *bden pa gnyis kyi rab tu byed pa),* etc., explaining Candra's intent. Atīśa taught them to the spiritual friend[114], [Drom]tonpa ('brom ston pa - 1005 – 1064). Then, in the [text] on the Stages of Path of the Three Individuals [called *Lamp on the Path to Enlightenment – bodhipathapradīpa*], [he used] Candrakīrti's tradition as the basis [for the presentation] of the aspects of the profound view; [such approach] survived until today.

[The tradition of] the actual commentaries on Chandra's scriptures [begins with] Nyima Drak (nyi ma grags - born in 1055) in the Patsap (pha tshab) family in Phenyul Gyel ('phan yul rgyal). He studied in India and Kashmir for 23 years, and invited [to Tibet] three pandits - Kanakavarman and others. In Rasa Trulnan (ra sa 'khrul snang) and other plases, he translated many of Candra's scriptures in general, and in particular translated and determined by explanation and study *the Root Wisdom, Engaging in the Middle Way, Four Hundred,* etc. It is said that he was active at the same time as the spiritual friend the great Sharawa [Yonten Drak](sha ra ba yon tan grags – 1070 – 1141) was engaged in explanation and study of Prajñāpāramita, and when the Lord Dusum Khyenpa (rje dus gsum mkhyen pa - the First Karmapa – 1110 – 1193) was practicing in Jazan Drak (ja bzang brag). The great Sharawa created many favourable conditions for [Translator] Patsap[115]'s scholarly activities and encouraged his [own] intelligent disciples to study Madhyamaka [with Patsap].

At that time there were four [disciples] known as the Four Sons of Patsap. Learned in both words and meaning was Mapcha Janchup Tsondru (rma bya byang chub brtson 'grus - passed away in 1185). They also say that he might be the same person as Chapa's disciple

Mapcha Tsope Senge (rma bya rtsod pa'i seng ge). Learned in words was Sarbo (sar sbos) from Tsan (gtsang). They say that a small number of monks who followed his [style of] explanation – listening existed in the Nyan [nyang] region. Learned in meaning was Rinchen Drak (rin chen grags) from Daryul (dar yul). They say that although he taught extensively nobody capable of holding his lineage appeared. The one equally [learned in] both words and meaning was Shan Junne Yeshe (zhang 'byung gnas ye shes) He established the Dharma University in Tansak (thang sag). Relying on the Translator Patsap's interlinear commentaries and his outlines of the texts, he himself also composed various commentaries [whose explanatory lineage is] uninterrupted up to the present day. He also taught the *Root Wisdom, Engaging* and *Four Hundred* treatises, [and gave] guiding explanations of the view of the Madhyamaka of Prāsaṅgika tradition.

At the end of approximately ten generations in the lineage transmitted from Shan, there came a scholar whose name was Marton Shonnu Gyaltsen (dmar ston gzhon nu rgyal mtshan). Many scholars from Utsan (dbu gtsang) studied with him. He had lots of disciples, and the great Lord Ronton [Sheja Kunrik] (rje rong ston shes bya kun rig - 1367 – 1449) was one of them.

In later times the Noble Lord Rendawa [Shonnu Lodro] (rje btsun red mda ba gzhon nu blo gros - 1349 – 1412) studied the Madhyamaka of Prāsaṅgika tradition with the Great Dokdokpa (mdog ldog pa chen po), they say. [I] don't know with whom the later one had studied. Rendawa wrote commentaries on *the Root, Engaging and Four Hundred* and also composed guiding explanations of the view. The one who studied with him was the Great Tsongkhapa.

c. How Acceptance and Rejection of These Two Came into Being

While Chapa was engaged in Svatāntrika Madhyamaka's explanation-learning, a holder of Candra's lineage, the paṇḍit named Jayānanda who commented on *Engaging in the Middle Way*, came to Tibet. At that time Chapa directly [challenged him through] debate and indirectly [challenged Prāsaṅgikans by] composing a treatise with a great variety of refutations of both the words and meaning of Candra's text. Regardless of what these refutations became, he definitely grasped the opponent's point of view.

Although at the time of the Great Translator Nok, the Prāsaṅgika scriptures were not translated, by relying on their sayings (which he heard either in the Land of Āryas or in Tibet), in refuting Prāsaṅgika [the Translator Nok] wrote a refutation of acceptance of the existence

of the realization of the Madhyamaka meaning without relying on three-moded syllogism[116]: "Without thought in their minds: "This compositional collection [i.e. skandhas] does not exist," such people who proclaim apparent things or their perfect refusal, deviate from the path of valid cognition and definitely fall into the great empty desert of wrong views." He also wrote a refutation of the followers of Yogācāra and Svatāntrika Madhyamaka: "Both those who accept some phenomenal existence by the power of reasoning and those who ascertain by valid cognition the suchness which is beyond the way of compounded phenomena, fall into the mouth of the great demon of unbearable grasping at things and are [thus] held fast by the sharp fans of [wrong] views." As for his own tradition, he explained that Nāgārjuna's [approach to] Madhyamaka has to be understood with the help of the reasoning of the author of *Pramāṇavartika*.

In later times, the great Jonanpa [Dolbopa Sherap Gyaltsen] (jo nang pa chen po dol bo pa shes rab rgyal mtshan - 1292 – 1361) said that what is actually taught as Madhyamaka by the scriptures of the master Candrakīrti, which belong to the Vehicle of Reasoning, is not suitable to be Madhyamaka since it is Dharma liable to objections. Madhyamaka is [to be understood] as it is explained by Shambhala's Dharma language[117]. This implies that the same thing has to be said about Svatāntrika Madhyamaka as well.

Also in later times, the Great Tsongkhapa explained that those who are known as [holders of] a Madhyamaka different from [the Madhyamaka] scriptures of Glorious Candra, don't possess correct view. He also said that all pure views of the Sūtras and Tantras necessarily belong only to this Prāsaṅgika tradition.

ii. The Spreading of the Dharmas of Maitreya and Their Followers in Tibet

They say that at the earlier time of the Dharma kings, when translations of [the root] texts [with] the commentaries of *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras* and the first [three] *Dharmas of Maitreya* were made, partial explanation-listening [of these texts] existed. However, the tradition of determining [their meaning] through learning and teaching, and emergence of this tradition's holders doubtlessly originated [with the works of Nok Loden Sherap]. He was prophesied by Buddha: "North of here, on the snow border, there will appear an Intelligent One [Loden]. He will have unobstructable intelligence in letters, Sanskrit and explanatory composition." This great being

extensively learned the *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras* with their commentaries from Pel Gomi Chime[118], lord Sthirapāla and others. He translated all five of *Maitreya's Scriptures,* and composed their extensive and abbreviated commentaries. In particular he translated, extensively commented upon and through learning-explanation perfectly determined *the Ornament of Clear Realizations* with Vimuktasena and Haribhadra's commentaries.

The word of his explanatory [lineage] came down primarily to the spiritual friend, the Great Dre Sherap Bar ('bre chen po shes rab 'bar)[119]. Before the Great Translator came [back] to Tibet [from India][120], this teacher had already learned the ocean-like Yogācāra scriptures from the spiritual friend the Great Mutra (mu tra chen po) and others. In Nenyin (gnas rnying) he established a university for studies of the *[Prajna]pāramita [Sūtras].*

From this teacher Chadulwa Tsondru Bar (bya 'dul ba brtson-'grus 'bar - 1091 – 1166) took monastic ordination and also studied the Abhidharma Teachings[121]. This Chadulwa had extremely broad learning. He studied Abhidharma with Nurmikpa (ngur smrig pa) also. [He learned] many Yogatantras as well. He studied the Vinaya with Gya (rgya)'s disciple Matso Janchup Dorje (rma gtso byang chub rdo rje) and became very learned in it. From Tolunpa Rinchen Nyinpo (stod lung pa rin chen snying po) he received Kadam[122] teachings. In Zulphu (zul phu) he established a monastic university. From him, Chapa received full ordination and extensively studied Vinaya, Abhidharma, etc.

The spiritual friend the Great Dre's explanation of *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras* and their commentaries, was perfectly passed down to Ar Janchup Yeshe (ar byang chub ye shes)[123]. He established [their] explanatory tradition in Namtseden (gnam rtse ldeng) and Shu Kungarawa (gzhu kun dga ra ba). His disciple was Duldzin Shonnu Tsultrim ('dul 'dzin gzhon nu tshul khrims). This [disciple] taught Janchup Bum (byang chub 'bum) who taught Nyelshik Jampe Dorje (gnyal zhig 'jam pa'i rdo rje).

This Nyelshik attained siddhis and also learned extensively from Chapa's disciples. They say that eighteen of his disciples composed Prajñāpāramita and Pramāṇa commentaties. Among them, Gyaton Chinrupa (rgya ston phying ru pa) established monastic university in Nyetan Dẹwachen (snye thang bde ba can). Zanrin Drakpa Darma Tsultrim (zang rings grags pa dar ma tshul khrims) established a monastic university in Trophu (khro phu). In the lineage of his disciples, Sonam Gonpo (bsod nams mgon po), known as the Valid

Being, was the one with whom the Omniscient Buton (bu ston thams cad mkhyen pa - 1290 – 1364) studied. Rinpoche Yakpa studied with him [i.e., Buton] and his disciple Lun Manpo (lung mang po).

Also another disciple of Nyelshik was Jowo Namkhapel (jo bo nam mkha dpal). He engaged in explanation-studying in Nyan To (nyang stod), where his disciple was the learned Ozer Gonpo ('od zer mgon po). For 32 years he was running a monastic establishment in Sanphulin Me (gsang phu gling smad) where Shakya Shonnu (shākya gzhon nu) and Janchup Shonnu (byang chub gzhon nu) became his disciples. Janchup Shonnu created a new [explanatory] style while Shakya Shonnu, holding to the old style of [his] teacher, founded a monastic establishment as well as the monastic university of Tsel Chokhorlin (tshal cho 'khor gling). His disciple is known as Lodro Tsunme (blo gros mtshung med). He was learned in all Mahāyāna teachings and was broadly educated. Lord Ranjun Dorje (rang byung rdo rje - the Third Karmapa – 1284 – 1339) received many teachings from him. He in his turn also received many teachings from Ranjun Dorje.

The Lord of Dharma Deshinshekpa (de bzhin gshegs pa - the Fifth Karmapa – 1384 – 1415) studied with the holder of Kharakpa (kha rag pa)'s [explanatory] stile, a person known as Nakshrikpa (nag hrig pa), [a holder of] the Kashipa[124] [degree]. Also Lord Thonwa Donden (mthong ba don ldan - the Sixth Karmapa – 1416 – 1453) studied with the Mongolian teacher Rinchen Zanpo (rin chen bzang po), who was also a holder of Kharakpa's style.

Although all excellent words of the Great Translator Nok were passed on to the Great Drolunpa (gro lung pa), physically, his monastic establishment was handed down to Shantsepon Chokyi Lama (zhang tshe pong chos kyi bla ma). Nyan Drenpa Chokyi Yeshe (nyang bran pa chos kyi ye shes) and Chapa Chokyi Senge took the monastic vows [of the novice] from him.

Chokyi Yeshe engaged in explanation-studying of Bodhisattvapitaka[125]: (*Compendium of Training [Śikṣāsamuccaya], Engaging in Bodhisattva Deeds [Bodhisattvacāryāvatara,* both written by Śāntideva], etc.), for a long time, and composed many commentaries [on it].

Chokyi Senge was born in the year when the Great Translator passed away. He achieved excellency in his studies and ran a monastic establishment for eighteen years. They say that during that time he had such [eminent] disciples as the Eight Great Lions (seng chen brgyad), the Three Wise Ones (shes rab can gsum), the Four Noble

Sons (jo sras bzhi) and the Three Accomplished Ones (grub thob gsum).

One of the Wise Ones was Hlodrenpa Darmasen (lho bran pa dar ma seng). He took monastic ordination from Chapa at the age of seventeen. During that same year he studied the ocean-like teachings of Yogācāra. What he had learned [about] that [Yogācāra system], survives until today in the form of notes contained in his *Big Commentary (ṭik chen)*. He established monastic university in Denbak Nechun (dan bag gnas chung) and Nenlam Tsulchen (ngan lam tshul chen) where he taught this [system]. They call him Hlopa Thamche Khyenpa (lho pa thams cad mkhyen pa - Omniscient One from the South).

Among the Great Lions, Tsek (brtsegs) held the explanatory tradition of Prajñāpāramita, Pramāṇa, the *Dharmas of Maitreya*, Madhyamaka, and ran a monastic establishment. Drusha Sonam Senge (bru sha bsod nams seng ge) established a monastic university in Narthan (snar thang). They say that although Tsannakpa Tsondru Senge (gtsang nag pa brtson 'grus seng ge) was learned in all the excellent words, his activities were not extensive. Parphuwa Lodro Senge (spar phu ba blo gros seng ge) was learned in all the excellent words and later, having studied with the great Phagmo Drupa (phag mo gru pa - 1110 – 1170), composed commentaries on *the Three Doha Cycles* (Tib.: *do ha skor gsum*) [of Saraha].

Chapa's explanatory tradition of Prajñāpāramita and Pramāṇa derives mainly from Drolunpa. Also, in later times two approaches, which originated from Nok's teachings, became known as "[the scholar] Ar's standpoint and the standpoint other than that."

Among the Four Noble Sons, the one known as Sa Jose Tsemo (sa jo sras rtse mo) relied on this teacher for about eleven years. He learned [from him] many excellent words of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, beginning with Madhyamaka and Pramāṇa. He had extensive interest in upholding the explanatory tradition.

As for the Three Accomplished Ones, there are two opinions on whether Shan Tselpa (zhang tshal pa) was a direct disciple [of Chapa] or not. Lord Dusum Khyenpa, known as Use (dbu se) extensively learned Madhyamaka, Pramāṇa and the *Dharmas of Maitreya*. As for his name, when he took monastic ordination from Choggi Lama (mchog gi bla ma), the direct disciple of the Great Translator, he was named Chokyi Lama (chos kyi bla ma)[126]. But in *Hulen Annals*[127], he appears under the name of Dorje Özer (rdo rje 'od zer).

Also, teachers explain that the first three *Dharmas of Maitreya* were translated in the earlier time of the Dharma kings, but the *Sublime Continuum* and *Distinguishing between Phenomena and Their Reality* for a long time disappeared even in the Land of Āryas until later, when one pandit named Maitreyanātha took them from a brick stupa and spread [their teachings]. This happened just prior to the time of the Great Translator Nok.

Other lamas of the past say that the bearer of Maitreya's name who rediscovered those *Dharmas*, was [in fact] the Great Bodhisattva Maitrīpa, and that those scriptures are Mahāmudrā[128] treatises.

The relative of bramin Ratnavajra, whose name was Sadjana, studied [these scriptures] with Maitrīpa, and the Great Translator Nok learned them from Sadjana himself. He made translations [of these texts] together with their commentaries.

The opinion of the Translator is that the meaning taught in the [first] four *Maitreya's Dharmas* is interpretive and the meaning taught in the *Sublime Continuum* is definitive. This [definitive meaning] is the one which bears the name of Sugata Essence. Also, [Nok] identified this [meaning] as the aspect of natural purity of all phenomena which embraces all knowables. It is a space-like non-affirming negative[129]. It is the one taught by the words: "There is nothing to eliminate here, [nothing at all to posit].[130]"

[A scholar] known as Yarlunpa Tsen Khawoche (yar lung pa btsan kha bo che – born in 1021) received the *Dharmas of Maitreya* when he was 60 years old. According to his successors, the definitive meaning as understood by him, is naturally pure primordial mind luminous by nature, which pervades [everybody] from Buddha to sentient beings. They say he taught that primordial mind to be Sugata essence.

In earlier times this [difference in approaches] was called "the difference between the explanation of the *Maitreya's Dharmas* as dialectical tradition and meditative tradition." But in both cases, there is no contradiction because at the time of eliminating grasping at signs, the first approach is more profound, while to turn [the view] into the basis of virtuous qualities, the second approach is needed.

Similar to that, interpreters of *Maitreya's Dharmas* produced two identifications of the unchangeable thoroughly established [phenomena][131]. They were explained [by some] as non-affirming negative, which is non-observation of grasped and grasper, and [by others] as the primordially established non-dual primordial mind. Both of them are also non-contradictory, as it is explained in the *Middle and Extremes*: "Here, non-existence of things which are persons and

phenomena is emptiness. Existence of the thing which is non-existence of [these] two things is characteristic of the empty thing." The intent of Lord Ranjun Dorje's commentaries on the three Inner Tantras[132] and *Distinguishing between Phenomena and Reality* was also the same.

Later Tibetans' identification of the definitive meaning of the last *Dharma of Maitreya* as "nothing other than emptiness of grasped and grasper being substantially different," greatly obscures [the correct] way of determining the definitive meaning of this *Dharma [of Maitreya]*.

iii. How Tantric Madhyamaka Came to Tibet.

This section has three parts: 1) early translation['s period], 2) intermediate translation['s period] and 3) later translation['s period].

a. Early Translations' Period

During the time [the Great] Master, the Emanation Body, Padmasambhava[133], stayed in Tibet, translations of Krīya, Chārya and Yoga Tantras in accordance with [their Indian] scriptures were completed. The intent of Anūttarayoga Tantras was divided into three: Mahāyoga, Anuyoga and Atiyoga, and taught orally. At that time there appeared many yogis who attained siddhis[134] by practicing mainly the third yoga. [This is] Atiyoga – the Great Perfection. It is taught that it came from the *Instructions of the Rosary of the View (man ngag lta ba'i phreng ba)*, which were composed by Padmasambhava himself. For those who follow the presentation of the Nine Vehicles, this view of Atiyoga has to be explained as the view of the uncommon Madhyamaka of Anūttarayogatantra[135].

b. Intermediate Translations' Period

During the intermediate [period of] translations, a person who translated many Tantras which had never been translated was the Great Translator Rinchen Zanpo (rin chen bzang po - 958 – 1055). He clarified the intents of all the Tantras through the practice tradition and composed a treatise [called] *Distinguishing between Dharma and non-Dharma (chos dang chos ma yin pa rnam par dbye ba'i bstan bcos)*. His disciple Hla Lama Yeshe O (lha bla ma ye shes 'od - 965 – 1036] and the successor in his lineage, Phodran Shiwa O (pho brang zhi ba 'od), composed many texts refuting [the scriptures] previously accepted as Tantras of authentic Indian sources.

Afterwards great translators Drogmi [Shakya Yeshe] ('brog mi shākya ye shes – 993 – 1074), Go [Khukpa Hletse] ('gos khug pa lhas btsas – contemporary of Marpa) and Marpa [Chokyi Lodro] (mar pa chos kyi blo gros - 1012 – 1097) translated the pith essence of the Dharma extract of the vehicles of Cakrasaṃvara, Hevajra, Guhyasamāja, etc. They spread and disseminated these [teachings] through scholarly activities and practice. The definitive meaning which became [known] at that time from instructions of the Path and Result[136], the Five Stages[137] and the Six Dharmas[138], is the Great Madhyamaka of Anūttarayogatantra, a definitive meaning not known to Svatāntrika and Prāsaṅgika Madhyamikas.

c. Later Translations' Period

Later translations include *the Abbreviated Tantra of Kālacakra,* the Big Commentary [on *Kālacakra*] called *"Stainless Light"* and the quintessential instructions on the Six Branches of Yoga (Tib.: rnal 'byor yan lag drug). [Their view is] the Great Madhyamaka not known to any Madhyamikas of the Pāramitayāna. It is definite that the presentation of this [view] is borne in the hearts of mighty yogis who attained learning and accomplishments.

Concluding Discussion

3. Concluding [the Text] with a Little Refutation and Establishment.

This section has three parts: 1) showing the disadvantage of the presence of the fault of abandoning Dharma if identification of Madhyamaka is too narrow, 2) showing that if its identification is on the other hand too broad, it will contradict scriptural authority, and 3) [showing that] the identification of Madhyamaka by later [scholars] does not agree with scriptural authority accepted in the [tradition of those scholars].

i. Showing the Disadvantage of a too Narrow Identification of Madhyamaka

In later times [both] Madhyamaka which is the peak of the views of the four proponents of tenets and [also] its scriptural tradition, became identified in the Snow Land as nothing other than what is known as Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika. [Adherents of this position] also explain that [the view of] this Madhyamaka is only non-affirming negative which is [here] the emptiness of true existence of all phenomena.

Saying this, one accumulates the karma of abandoning Dharma: Thus, the defamation of the word of the Third Dharmacakra with the treatises commenting on its intent comes about by labeling them as Proponents of Phenomenal Existence. This was prophesied by Lord Maitreya himself: "There is nobody in the world more knowlegable than the Victor...," etc[139]. If Ārya Asaṅga didn't teach the Madhyamaka of definitive meaning in [his] commentaries on [*Maitreya's] Dharmas*, [etc.,] it would contradict Buddha's own prophesying him as [the one who will] distinguish the interpretive and definitive [meanings]. They [i.e.Gelukpas] say that in the commentary on the *Sublime Continuum*, he interpreted [it] as being a Prāsaṅgika [scripture]. Nevertheless, these are just words and nothing else since any discriminating person, having taken a look [at it], will directly establish that this commentary doesn't agree with Candrakīrti's way of commenting[140].

If Tantric Madhyamaka is explained as non-affirming negation, emptiness endowed with the most supreme of all aspects will not be identified. [Otherwise,] it will be identified as something different, and whatever [this "something" is], it will be undermined by

scriptural authority. Similarly, the union of bliss and emptiness will not be identified. Beside that, how will the "body of oneness of mind and knowables," etc., be explained? Explaining these as the false truth is a belittlement of the ultimate truth of the Tantric tradition. Not only that; in *Kālacakra*, the view that the emptiness which is non-affirming negative is [that very] emptiness which is united with great bliss, is clearly refuted. The examples used are impossibility of grapes being produced from a Nimba[141] tree, nectar being produced from poisonous leaves and a lotus being produced from a Brahma[142] tree.

ii. Showing that a too Broad Identification Contradicts Scriptural Authority

They say that since the identification of the ultimate truth in the Third Dharmacakra with the commentaries on its intent, does not surpass emptiness of substantial difference of grasped and grasper[143], [this is the view of] the Proponents of Phenomenal Existence. Nevertheless [in reality] there is no such identification of [ultimate] emptiness in those scriptural traditions. What is it then? All entirely imputed "grasped" [phenomena], such as external things, etc., and also all entirely imputed "graspers" like consciousness appearing as those [external phenomena], etc., are identified as emptiness in [their] own nature, and only naturally pure primordial mind left in remainder of that [negation] is explained as ultimate truth.

—But since they accept this [ultimate truth] to be truly established, it is not appropriate [for them] to be Madhyamikas.

—Since you accept that the emptiness of true establishment is an ultimate, it is not appropriate for you either to be Madhyamika, because the feature of being established as ultimate truth but not being truly established does not appear in any scriptural tradition of the past, whether valid or non-valid.

—But although the definitive meaning derived from those scriptural traditions was explained by the noble Maitreya as Madhyamaka, [its] explanations by Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti as not Madhyamaka are more powerful.

—But Asaṅga also, having quoted the Sūtras, explained their [Candra and Bhāvya's] interpretations as a view of belittlement. Also, in Indian instructions' scriptures and in sūtras, the emptiness explained by the Proponents of Entitylessness was called "the emptiness of matter," "nihilistic emptiness" and "overextended emptiness."

Thus, since in the qualified scriptures partial refutations of both types of identification of definitive meaning were made, it is not possible to engage in a mutual refutation of one [viewpoint] using another [viewpoint] without having analyzed their profound intents.

iii. Showing that the Identification of Madhyamaka by Later Scholars does not Agree with Their Accepted Scriptural Authority

Later Tibetans say that this profound definitive meaning called "emptiness" is nothing else than [the one taught by] Candrakīrti's scriptures. As it is said: "Let scholars be certain that in the same way as this Dharma does not exist elsewhere, the tradition which originates here also does not exist elsewhere"[144]. They explain that this [emptiness] is a subject established by valid cognition, empty of the object of negation, which is "the establishment by one's own characteristics." Otherwise, [they continue,] if one meditates on, say,. son of a barren woman being truthless, which seeds of obscurations will this person manage to abandon?[145] To support those [statements] they interpret the scriptures where Candra was refuting Mere Knowing school as a refutation of Bhāvya[146]. They explain that if at the time of determining emptiness, one does not separately identify the object of negation, he will fall into the extreme of nihilism. They say that the tantric union of bliss and emptiness also has to be explained as such emptiness realized by subjective great bliss. They say, it is like having to explain the direct realization of emptiness by kindness (great compassion), as "emptiness with the essence of compassion."

All such words don't accord with any of the scriptures used by them as the source [to prove their views]: In Madhyamaka scriptures, it is explained that [all] four extremes of conceptualization have to be eliminated. But you don't explain anything else than the elimination of the extreme of true existence and the extreme of conventional non-existence.

In Madhyamaka scriptures it is taught that the elimination of the extreme of being neither comes down to refutation of the extreme of being both, whereas the refutation of the extreme of non-existence depends on the refutation of the extreme of existence, etc. Thus it is taught that when an opposite in mutually eliminating [contradiction] is negated, another opposite is also negated. But as the mainstream [of your thought] you use [the view which says that] when one of the two [parts of] mutual contradiction has been refuted, another [part] is automatically established.

The contradiction between that [viewpoint] and the scriptures is [clear from the following]: In [Madhyamaka] scriptures, dependant existence is understood as establishment through dependance, which is in turn understood as non-establishment: "Victors taught that establishment dependant on mutually related phenomena is non-establishment." In this [Madhyamaka] tradition [of Proponents of Entitylessness] it is clear that if in remainder of negation of "being," "non-being," etc., is established, it will follow that in remainder of negation of the object of negation, other phenomenon is cast and not all extremes of conceptualization will be negated. As the object of negation by Madhyamaka reasons, you don't accept anything else other than what is "established by one's own characteristics." Thus you cannot abandon the extreme of nihilism and the extreme of non-existence, and so proclamation of emptiness of emptiness becomes unnecessary[147].

Also, since [you] are not able to accept that Mahāyāna āryas have more superior realization of emptiness than that of the Śrāvakas and Pratyekas, it is clear that [you accept] that Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas have a complete realization of selflessness of phenomena[148].

Since you accept "individual," "mere self" and others of the "twelve creating individuals" as established by valid cognition, you are similar to the heretics[149].

If in the Abhidharmas of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna[150] there were no correct identification of the self of person and selflessness of person, it would follow that there is no distinction made between outsiders and insiders[151] [on that level].

If [one accepts that] when [the mind] is engaged in true mode of abiding the proof, the probandum and the subject [of syllogism] are established by valid cognition, it is clear that [he] won't be able to refute the private [syllogism of Svatāntrikas][152].

If the real Madhyamaka meaning were not taught by Bhāvaviveka's writings, it clearly won't be correct for Candra to use the quote: "... that which was well explained by Bhāvaviveka..."[153]

If at the time [of engaging in the true mode of abiding], there were direct or inferential perceptions realizing emptiness, it would contradict [the statement] of *Engaging in Bodhisattva Deeds* [that] "the ultimate is not the object of mind functioning – [mind is accepted to be false]." [Likewise it will contradict following statements:] the sūtra's statement that "ultimate truth transcends even objects of omniscience" quoted in *Engaging in the Middle Way* and other texts,

Atīśa's "there is no need for direct and inferential [cognitions]" and [his] "master scholar Bhāvya taught that it is not cognized by conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses," etc.

Not only that, but [such statements] are also undermined by reasoning since the isolate, elimination of other, being made direct object of perception by direct valid cognition, was refuted by the reasoning of the author of the *Commentary on Valid Cognition*[154].

This way of explaining emptiness [as] the negation of the object of negation not established by valid cognition on the basis of the subject established by valid cognition, contradicts explicit teachings of the *Prajñāpāramita Sūtras*. Not only that, in the treatise of Candra himself it is said[155]: "Since its nature is that, eye is empty of eye," etc. He taught this, directly applying [the same reasoning] to all subjects [of emptiness].

Reasoning also [shows] that emptiness, where phenomenon established by valid cognition, like a pot, is empty of the object of negation which is not established by valid cognition, is the worst among even those emptinesses which appear in the scriptures of Proponents of Emptiness of Other. This is because it is identified as [the emptiness where] the subject, impure other-powered phenomenon, is empty of the object of negation, entirely imputed phenomenon lacking identity[156].

—With an explanation of all objects of knowledge as emptiness of oneself in this tradition of [Candra] it won't be possible to abandon objections given in, "If all of them were empty...," etc[157]. [Will it]?

—This is not impossible: an answer to that is given by the words: "Explanation of Dharma by Buddhas is based on the two truths...," etc[158]. How does this work? In general, when the two truths are separated, non-existence [of things] as true is emphasized [by Madhyamikas]. But since that debate of the Proponents of Phenomenal Existence is [an attempt to] refute false [truth] having used ultimate [truth] as the reason, the answer is: "[It is not correct] because [the phenomena still] exist falsely"[159]. As it is said: "Teachings on countless [eons], etc., don't withstand [the critique from the point of view] of the ultimate meaning. [But from the point of view] of the false [truth] Muni accepts those concordant causes of kindness."

Oh, wonder!
The one whose body has the nature of the Five Bodies of the
 Perfect Buddha[160],
Speech is the Lord of Speech Mañjuśrī,

Your mind is the owner of compassionate mind Avalokita,
And mighty power is the Lord of Power [Vajrapāṇi][161]. You are the protector of this world!
Although you don't abandon your own place, the origin of bliss, crown ornament[162],
You move in the vast sky without obstructions.
Also your name is like the sun, it is famous as Karmapa[163]. Prompted by your order

[I composed] this *Wish Fulfilling Meru [treatise on] the origination of Madhyamaka.*

Let it not be suppressed by the mountains of pride of opponents,
Let the Playful One who enjoys the ten manifestations[164]
In unstirred inner oceans[165] of primordial mind
Never tire of supporting it correctly!
In the same way as the sun was drawn out
From the bottom of the poisonous ocean, by the Powerful Proud Magician,
Let the bright light of the sun of Muni's Doctrine
Be liberated from the vicious mouth of Rāhu[166]!
Let then its chariot[167] which pulls all migrators in the right [direction]
On the great path of benefit and happiness
Never deviate to tortuous paths
[And finally reach] the place of complete victory! This is my dedication.

[This] treatise called *"The Wish Fulfilling Meru," - A Discourse Explaining the Origination of Madhyamaka* was composed by the Glorious Shakya Chokden Drime Lekpe Lo (shā kya mchog ldan dri med legs pa'i blo) in Serdokchen Dharma University of Yeru (gyas ru) in Tsan (gtsang) and offered [by him] to the lord of enlightened activities of all Victors of three times who embraces [everything] with [the look of his] compassionate eyes, as he sits firmly on the lion throne of the Dharma seat among the ocean-like gathering of disciples in the great temple of Rasa Trulnan (ra sa 'phrul snang).

Written down by Konton Chokyi Gyaltsen Pel Zanpo (kong ston chos kyi rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po).

Śubham!

Part Two

Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning

Entering the Gates to the Essential Points of the Two Truths

Swastiprajābhya!

Respectfully I make prostrations,
Having offered a garland of Kumuda [flowers][168]
Blossomed in the ocean of [my] heart
Where the reflection of a fearless young moon[169] dwells!

Having first prostrated myself, with the help of Candra's treatises I'm going to open the two gates to enter the great mansion of definitive meaning. What are these two? They are the two gates, one to enter [it by] action through acceptance of the false truth, and another to enter [it by] the view through acceptance of the ultimate truth.

I. The Way of Entering the Great Mansion of Definitive Meaning through Acceptance of the False Truth.

[The way] is acceptance [of things] as [they are] known in the world [or by worldly ones]. The term "worldly ones" is not applied only to ordinary individuals. Rather, [in this case] it means all innate minds grasping at signs due to ignorance until the predisposition for ignorance is eliminated. When an explanation is made emphasizing these very minds, which accept the first truth, it is done as follows:

There are two types of appearances [arising] in the mental field of worldly ones—wrong appearances and correct appearances. The first type is appearances of consciousness deceived by an immediate cause. They are such appearances of mistaken sense consciousness as [visions of] falling hair and two moons [in the case of eye disorders], and superimpositions of mistaken mental consciousnesses deceived by wrong tenets—superimpositions such as [the ideas of] "self" and production from the four extremes [of self, other, both and neither].

The second type is appearances of innate consciousness caused by ignorance[170] without being deceived by an immediate cause. These are the five types of external objects appearing to sense consciousnesses. This type also includes appearances of mental consciousness, such as the "mere I," a sprout established by nature and production by nature, [which are] objects grasped through the mode of apprehension of the two types of innate self-grasping[171].

These wrong and correct [appearances] are respectively called "false truth from the point of view of the world" and "ultimate truth [from the point of view of the world]." The first of these two is not accepted as existent even by the world itself, because while not

existing it [still] appears in a wrong way due to [the immediate causes of] mistake. The second type of appearances is accepted as existent according to common knowledge [of the world] because all instances of these appearances are the ultimate truth for that knowledge]. That very approach was intended by the auto-commentary on *Two Truths* [by Jñānagarbha] when the following words of a sūtra were quoted: "That which is made ultimate by some [individuals] is accepted as false by others. That same person who is the mother of someone is viewed as the wife by another."

From the standpoint of this explanation, the two types of "self" imputed by tenets are not posited as existent even in the world[ly mind], because worldly ones also accept them as a false truth. But the two types of "self" imputed by innate ignorance have to be accepted as existent from the point of view of the world itself, because they are accepted as ultimate truth by worldly ones.

What this explanation proves is as follows: That which posits the ultimate truth of worldly ones is innate ignorance. That which posits the ultimate truth of āryas is awareness of primordial mind[172]. Both ultimate truth of the world and that which is posited as truth by common knowledge [of the world][173] are called in āryas' conventions "false truth of the world," because both are similar in being true within the framework of [worldly] minds and similar in not being true within the framework of awareness of primordial mind. Thus, there is no difference in existence and non-existence of these two conventionally.

In brief, the reasoning is as follows: If something is named 'correct false truth' in āryas' conventions and accepted as ultimate truth by worldly ones, it has to exist in the world. For example, a chariot. The two types of self, which are objects grasped through the mode of apprehension of the two types of innate self-grasping, are also named 'correct false truth' in āryas' conventions and accepted as ultimate truth by worldly ones. [Thus, they exist in the world.]

Then, who accepts the view that 'chariot exists but self doesn't exist'? It is approved by Buddhist Proponents of Phenomenal Existence. It is not approved by Madhyamaka's own tradition since in that tradition both of them are equally [viewed as] not being existent.

Those inhabitants of the Snow Land who don't know this approach in which the mode of presenting self, chariot and so forth by Buddhist tenets supercedes [the mode of doing it by] common knowledge of the world say, 'Whatever is accepted by the worldly

ones is Madhyamaka tradition.' Presenting the conventional truth of the world, they say: 'Self exists, but [it] does not [exist in] a true [way].' They also say. 'Self, which is the basis of karma and its results, exists, but self of person does not exist.'[174] [All] these statements clearly show to the world that either [their author] didn't take even the slightest pains to look with an eye of intelligence at the garland of white light of Candra's perfect elucidations, or with a brush of crooked discrimination he took dark ink stirred by evil ideas and colored Candra's face black.

II. The Way of Entering the Great Mansion of Definitive Meaning through Acceptance of the Ultimate Truth

This section has two divisions: 1) how to practice at the time of severing conceptual elaborations by the view, and; 2) how to proceed at the time of applying conventions by knowledge-expressions of āryas.

A. How to Practice at the Time of Severing Conceptual Elaborations by the View

This has two steps. First, when conceptual elaborations that grasp at truth are being severed, one ceases partial conceptual elaborations and practices concordant ultimate truth. After that, when conceptual elaborations that grasp at truthlessness are being severed, one ceases all masses of conceptual elaborations and practices final definitive meaning[175].

B. How to Proceed at the Time of Applying Conventions by Knowledge-Expressions of Āryas

The way of applying conventions [by āryas] is of two types. One emphasizes the negation of imputations of worldly minds, while the other emphasizes the negation of imputations of yogis' minds.

On the level of first [reasoning], all the types of correct false truth explained above are posited as wrong false truth, because while non-existing they appear due to ignorance. Why are they non-existent? They are non-existent because they are not found under investigation by the reasoning of āryas[176] and because they appear due to ignorance only. Since other types of correct false truth [beside those explained above] are not accepted on this level, they are posited as false truth. They are named 'false truth of the world'.

Ultimate truth [posited] on this level is a sprout empty of truth, [a vase] empty of nature, etc. These [types of ultimate truth] are accepted as existent according to the conventions of āryas, because they are established by valid cognition approved by āryas.

On the level of second reasoning, all the types of ultimate truth explained above have to be interpreted as false truth, because they serve as the objects of sounds and concepts[177]. Although this is so, nevertheless they are not accepted as wrong false [truth], because they are not posited by the power of ignorance. They are named 'false truth of the yogis' and 'correct false truth.' When Bhāvaviveka said, "it is not appropriate for the learned ones to scale the great building of the true [meaning] without the ladder of correct false truth," and Candra said, "if one asks whether the ultimate also is conventional truth, [the answer will be] 'yes, it is'," they also intended that very meaning [which was just explained].

If false truth on this level is like that, what then is ultimate truth [here]? The term 'ultimate truth is beyond all expressions' is used. Nevertheless, one cannot express it by such words as 'the basis of definition of ultimate truth is this [or that].' On this level, one has safely entered that which is the great mansion of definitive meaning.

> Thus there are quickly thrown open
> The two great gates-
> Smooth path leading
> To the mansion of glorious Madhyamaka.

This "*Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning, - Entering the Gates of the Essentials of the Two Truths*" was written in the middle of Yeru in Tsan by Jampel Gawe Shenen ('jam dpal dga ba'i bshes gnyen), who, born in a land of Central [Tibet] rich in forests, enjoys the tradition of Madhyamaka treatises with the eyes of discrimination.

Mangalam!

Part Three

Great Ship of Discrimination that Sails into the Ocean of Definitive Meaning

A Treatise Differentiating the Tenets of Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika Madhyamakas

I. Brief Presentation

Homage to Mañjuśrī!

I prostrate to all charioteers!
With discourses that, like Sarasvati[178], charm the minds of all
You drive higher and higher the vehicles of the mind
That constantly yearns for the quest of perfect elucidations!
Now when I explain here the supreme tradition,
Unknown to others, of the four charioteers of Madhyamaka,
Who keep in motion [chariots of] interpretive and definitive [teachings] of the scholars [called] "six ornaments"[179]
[You can] count [all of them together] as ten great ornaments beautifying Jambudvipa.
[This is] the homage and promise to compose [the text that] precedes [the actual body of the text]

II. Extensive Explanation

In the beginning there emerged two great [pioneering] traditions of the [Madhyamaka] chariot interpreting the definitive meaning derived from Madhyamaka treatises composed by the being of great nature, Ārya Nāgārjuna. [One tradition] interprets [Nāgārjuna's intent] according to Yogācāra treatises and [the other tradition] interprets [his intent] according to the Niḥsvabhāvavāda method[180]. [Advocates of] the first are the master Vasubandhu and the Glorious Dharmapāla, and Śāntipa and others who came later. [Advocates of] the second are the masters Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka and others.

The existence of these two methods of interpreting Nāgārjuna's intent is illustrated by the words of the *Madhyamaka Ornament* written by the master Śāntarakṣita: "Those who drive the chariot of the two methods with the reins of reasoning gain possession of the Great Vehicle thereby." Also, in Śāntipa's [text] known as the *Madhyamaka Ornament*, it is said, "Herein I will explain the two truths proven in valid scriptural statements that were taught by Maitreya and Asaṅga and accepted by Nāgārjuna." Jowo Atiśa also said, "Ratnakaraśānti [,i.e. Śāntipa] says that the treatises of Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga are concordant."

Son-of-the-Victor Śāntideva, the master Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti were the initiators of the tradition that first explained that the advocates of the first pioneering tradition hadn't realized the final intent of the master Nāgārjuna and then

interpreted it in a Niḥsvabhāvavāda way. Among them, although Son-of-the-Victor Śāntideva refuted the interpretation of Nāgārjuna's intent as Mind Only, he didn't pioneer traditions of either Prāsaṅgika or Svatāntrika chariots. The traditions of Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika were first pioneered by Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka and then clarified by Candrakīrti.

This was a brief presentation. The extensive explanation of it has two parts: 1) how the Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika branches diverged, and; 2) the explanation of the differences of their tenets.

A. How the Prāsaṇgika and Svatāntrika Branches Diverged

First, when he was explaining the meaning of these words in the beginning of [*Madhyamaka*] *Treatise*[181]: "Neither from self nor from other, not from both, not without causes—any phenomenon in any circumstance is never produced," Buddhapālita wrote: "The subject, 'any phenomenon in any circumstance,' is never produced from itself, because if there is production from self [it will follow that this] production is meaningless and limitless," etc. Thus [Buddhapālita] refuted production from the four extremes, using four consequences[182]. But he didn't posit autonomous syllogisms establishing the non-existence of production from the four extremes.

After him, the master Bhāvaviveka wrote: "The subject, 'any phenomenon—eye, etc.—in any circumstance,' is never produced from itself, because it exists. It is like, for example, an existent consciousness. This subject, [any phenomenon, etc.,] is not truly produced from other, because it is different [from that other]. It is like, for example, a vase and woolen cloth," etc. Thus [Bhāvaviveka] posited four autonomous syllogisms[183]. He presented various reasonings refuting the master Buddhapālita['s approach, which] didn't use autonomous reasons and examples at the time of negating production from the four extremes.

After him, the master Candrakīrti took the side of the master Buddhapālita. He presented many refutations of Bhāvaviveka's standpoint and extensively explained how the faults ascribed by Bhāvaviveka to Buddhapālita didn't [really] undermine [the position of the latter].

These are the only reasons why Madhyamaka branched into Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika[184]. As it is said in *Madhyamaka Clear Words (Prasannapadā)*: "The master Buddhapālita also taught that

'phenomena are not produced from themselves, because [otherwise] their production will turn to be meaningless and [other] extreme consequences [of this statement] will arise,' etc. The master Bhāvaviveka disapproved of this line of reasoning in the following way: 'It is not correct because [a] the reason and example are not stated, [b] the fault of what others have said is not eliminated, and [c] since [these] are the words of the consequence, by reversing the given meaning, the meaning of a thesis and its probandum become clear, and thus phenomena will turn to be produced from other, production will have results, production will become limited, and [consequently] contradictions with [your] tenets will arise'. But we see [the imputation of] all these faults as unreasonable." And the quote continues, "If a person is a Madhyamaka follower, autonomous inferential cognition[185] is not appropriate, because there is no acceptance of other standpoints." Also [Candra] said: "Reversed meaning of the consequence is related to opponents, not to us, because we don't have statements."

B. The Explanation of the Differences of their Tenets

This section has two parts: 1)the presentation of my own tradition and 2) [showing] the traditions of others as incompatible.

1. The Presentation of My Own Tradition

[There are six parts in it:] 1)[explanation of] the difference [between the Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika interpretation] of the reason, (that which establishes), 2)[explanation of] the difference [between their interpretations of] the thesis, (that which is established), 3)[explanation of] the difference [between their interpretations of] valid cognition, (that which measures), 4)[explanation of] the difference [between their interpretations of] the object, (that which is measured), 5)[explanation of] the mode of existence of temporal difference [between their interpretations of] the view and 6)conclusion by [showing] the final similarity [in their understanding of] the view.

i. [Explanation of] the Difference [between the Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika Interpretation] of the Reason, (That Which Establishes)

According to Svatāntrika, there are five syllogisms establishing truthlessness and non-production by nature: [1] the syllogism of separation from one and many; [2] the syllogism of vajra fragments;

[3] the syllogism negating production as existent and non-existent; [4] the syllogism negating production in four ways; and [5] the syllogism of dependent existence[186].

According to Prāsaṅgika, these [five] are not autonomous syllogisms, because [1] the valid cognition that measures the three modes[187] and the subject is not established as common appearance for both proponent and opponent; [2] "existence as true" is negated on the basis of subject, eye, etc., but "non-existence as true" is not established; and [3] there is no [autonomous] thesis of one's own tradition at the time of analyzing the ultimate.

Why is the valid cognition measuring three modes and the subject not established as common appearance for both [proponent and opponent]? It doesn't exist [for both] because for [something] to be valid cognition in Madhyamaka's own tradition, it has to be a valid cognition measuring the ultimate[188]. However, the three modes and the subject of the syllogism of separation from one and many, etc., are conventional truth.

Having thus refuted [Svatāntrikas], in their own tradition [Prāsaṅgikans presented] four reasonings negating true establishment [of phenomena]: [1] an inferential cognition known to others[189]; [2] consequence revealing contradictions[190]; [3] equalizing by similar reasons[191]; and [4] non-establishment due to the similarity of the proof and thesis[192].

The first one is shown by such words as: "Since, in suchness, [phenomena are] not produced from self, other and both, and don't exist without dependence, phenomena don't have nature." The second one is shown by such words as: "If one conceives that something that has already been produced, is produced again, then production of a sprout, etc., won't be found here, and the seed will be thoroughly produced till the end of existence." The third one is shown by such words as: "If something different were to be produced in dependence on other [phenomenon], then thick darkness will arise from the tongues of fire and everything will be produced from everything." The fourth one is shown by such words as: "So, the eye in dreams also is accepted as the cause of perception by a false subject. Seeing that every answer given by this [opponent] is similar to the thesis [which he tries to prove by] that [answer, Madhyamikas] eliminate this polemic"[193].

ii. *The Difference between [Their Interpretations of] the Thesis, That Which is Established.*

According to Svatāntrika, there are two [types of] reasonings [used to] enter the ultimate truth: reasonings that sever conceptual elaborations grasping at truth and reasonings that sever conceptual elaborations [grasping at] truthlessness. On the level of the first type of reasonings there is autonomous thesis, probandum of correct syllogism[194] and inferential cognition which takes this [probandum] as its object. On this same level, non-affirming negatives, the objects [of the reasonings], are accepted as the real ultimate truth, while inferential cognitions, which take these [non-affirming negatives] as their objects, are accepted as real subjective ultimate [truth].

According to Prāsaṅgika, at the time of severing conceptual elaborations grasping at truth, existence-as-true is abandoned, but non-existence-as-true is not established: If in the [process of negating] one conceptual elaboration another conceptual elaboration is established as a 'remainder' [of that negation], it will be impossible to sever [all] conceptual elaborations and [the process of severing] will become limitless. Thus [Prāsaṅgikans] admit that at the time of analyzing the ultimate there is no any statement and acceptance at all.

In brief, [these two traditions] are to be known as "the tradition of Svatāntrika which severs superimpositions gradually and the tradition of Prāsaṅgika which severs superimpositions simultaneously."

iii. The Difference [between Their Interpretations of] Valid Cognition, That Which Measures.

On the level of the two truths, Svatāntrika accepts two types of valid cognition – direct and inferential – as definite in number. On the level of the two truths, Prāsaṅgika accepts four types of valid cognition, having added [to the previous two] valid cognition through an analogy and valid cognition based on scriptural authority[195].

iv. The Difference [between Their interpretations of] the Object, That Which is Measured.

Svatāntrika temporarily accepts as efficient ultimate truth non-affirming negatives in which only one set of the conceptual elaborations is negated, such as 'a vase empty of truth'. Prāsaṅgika considers that if all conceptual elaborations are not negated on the basis of, say, a vase, then [such] non-affirming negatives, in which only one set of conceptual elaborations is severed, can be only false

truth. Thus [Prāsaṅgika] doesn't accept this even temporarily as efficient ultimate truth.

v. Temporal Differences [between Their Interpretations of] the View.

According to Svatāntrika, a clinging mind that clings to the truthlessness of a sprout based on the syllogism of separation from one and many, is temporarily accepted as an efficient Madhyamaka view. [This school] accepts the continuity of that clinging mind as an object of practice by the yoga of union of calm abiding and special insight.

According to Prāsaṅgika, this clinging mind is not accepted as an efficient Madhyamaka view, because it is grasping at signs. The object of that mind is also not accepted as efficient ultimate truth, because it is the object of expressive sounds and concepts.

vi. Conclusion by Showing the Final Similarity of [Their Understanding of] the View.

In the end, both Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika come to the same view. Although Svatāntrika temporarily accepts as ultimate truth non-affirming negatives in which only one set of conceptual elaborations is negated, in the end it also comes to accept them [merely] as correct false [truth] and nominal ultimate [truth]. Also, although the mind that realizes such [ultimate truth] is temporarily accepted as the Madhyamaka view, in the end it is accepted [merely] as concordant ultimate [truth]. From the *Two Truths*: "Negation of production, etc., is also accepted [just] because it is concordant with the holy meaning. Thus, it is false..." From *Madhyamaka Ornament*: "Because of being concordant with the holy meaning, it is called 'holy meaning'. In reality, that [real holy meaning] is free from all masses of conceptual elaborations." From *Madhyamaka Essence*: "It is not appropriate for the learned ones to scale the great building of the true [meaning] without the ladder of correct false truth"[196].

2. Refutation of Traditions of Others.

It has two parts: 1) enumeration of assertions and 2) refutation of inappropriate aspects.

i. Enumeration of Assertions

Some Indians taught: "[There are two types of Madhyamaka:] Madhyamaka Which Accepts Illusion as Established by Reasoning and Madhyamaka of Thorough non-Abiding.[197] The second one is

also of two types because it is divided into Thorough non-Abiding of Severed Continuity and Thorough non-Abiding of Union." Translator Patsap taught: "The one which accepts valid cognition by the power of things is Svatāntrika. The one which does not accept it is Prāsaṅgika ." Sakya Pandita's assertion is expressed by [his] words: "The acceptance of non-deceiving [phenomena] even on the conventional level is tradition of Pramāṇa. Svatāntrika mostly agrees with that." Translator Nok taught: "Also, the division into the two traditions of Thorough non-Abiding and Illusion-like One surprises [only] fools." Later inhabitants of the Land of Snows taught: "With Madhyamaka taken for a basis [of division], that which accepts phenomena being established on the conventional level by their own characteristics is Svatāntrika, and that which doesn't accept such [phenomena] is Prāsaṅgika "[198].

ii. Refutation of Inappropriate Aspects

This last tradition is inappropriate. What do you call 'own characteristics'? Do you accept them to be uncommon [features that] posit phenomena or 'own characteristics' that are the objects of negation by [Madhyamaka] reasons? If it is the former, then the master Candrakīrti also accepts it, because in *Engaging in the Middle Way* he accepts the characteristics of [all] phenomena from form till omniscience[199]: "Form has characteristic of 'that which is suitable to be penetrated'," etc. If it is the second, then [the following question arises]: Does Svatāntrika accept the objects of negation by [Madhyamaka] reasons at the time of positing false truth or at the time of positing ultimate truth? If it is the latter, it will follow that the subject, Svatāntrika Madhyamaka, [admits that it] accepts true establishment, because it accepts phenomena established by their own characteristics on the ultimate level. The reason is acceped[200]. If it is the former, it will follow that the subject, master Candrakīrti, accepts the object of negation by Madhyamaka reasonings, because at the time of positing false truth he accepts phenomena established by their own characteristics. The pervasion is accepted. The reason is [also] established, because at the time of positing ultimate truth of the common knowledge of the world itself, the worldly ones accept phenomena established by their own characteristics, while Candrakīrti accepts false truth in accordance with the way known in the world[201].

> If [you] wish to observe the suchness of the four continents
> of definitive meaning

Relying on the great gait of the sun and the moon of
Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika,
Take the wheels of this chariot driven by
The charioteer of discrimination unknown to others.

This treatise on differentiation of the tenets of Svatāntrika and Prāsaṅgika Madhyamakas called "*Great Ship of Discrimination Which Sails into the Ocean of Definitive Meaning*" was composed by the Madhyamika from the Central province (yul dbus), Jampel Gawe Shenen in the middle of Yeru in Tsan by request of "seated-just-once"[202] Lodro Tenpa (blo gros brtan pa). Written down by [spiritual] friend Kunga Tashi (kun dga bkra shis).

Mangalam!

Part Four

Appendices

An Outline, Notes, Glossary and Bibliography

An Outline

Part One: Wish Fulfilling Meru

(Treatise Called "Wish Fulfilling Meru,"-A Discourse Explaining the Origination of Madhyamaka.)

INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATION OF MADHYAMAKA

- I. Definition of the Middle Path
- II. Explanation of the Defined Term
  - A. Identification of Extremes
    - 1. Identification in General
    - 2. Identification in this Case
    - 3. Refutation of Objections
  - B. Identification of the Path
  - C. Establishment of the Path as "The Middle"

DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS TYPES OF MADHYAMAKA

- III. Divisions of the Basis of Definition
  - A. Brief Presentation of Divisions
    - 1. The Nature of Divisions
    - 2. The Sources of Divisions
    - 3. Showing Others' Assertions as Narrow

THE ORIGINATION OF MADHYAMAKA IN INDIA

  - B. Extensive Explanation
    - 1. How Madhyamaka Treatises were Composed
      - i. How Glorious Saraha Pioneered Madhyamaka
      - ii. How Madhyamaka was Pioneered by the Two Great Charioteers
        - a. How the Tradition Pioneered by Nāgārjuna and his Followers Appeared in the Land of Āryas
        - b. How the Tradition Pioneered by Asaṅga and his Brother Appeared in the Land of Āryas
        - c. The Way of Interpreting [the Traditions of] the Two Pioneers as Non-Contradictory
      - iii. Showing the Indispensability of Explaining Tantric Madhyamaka Separately
        - a. Brief Presentation

b. More Extensive Explanation
c. Refutation of Objections

THE SPREADING OF MADHYAMAKA IN TIBET

2. How Madhyamaka Treatises Came to Tibet
   i. The Spreading of the Madhyamaka of Nāgārjuna [and his Spiritual] Sons in Tibet
      a. How Svatāntrika Came to Tibet
      b. How the Madhyamaka Known as Prāsaṅgika Came to Tibet
      c. How Acceptance and Rejection of These Two Came into Being
   ii. The Spreading of the Dharmas of Maitreya and Their Followers in Tibet
   iii. How Tantric Madhyamaka Came to Tibet
      a. Early Translations' Period
      b. Intermediate Translations' Period
      c. Later Translations' Period

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

3. Concluding [the Text] with a Little Refutation and Establishment
   i. Showing the Disadvantage of a too Narrow Identification of Madhyamaka
   ii. Showing that a too Broad Identification Contradicts Scriptural Authority
   iii. Showing that the Identification of Madhyamaka by Later Scholars does not Agree with Their Accepted Scriptural Authority

Part Two: Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning

(Entering the Gates to the Essential Points of the Two Truths)

I. The Way of Entering the Great Mansion of Defifnitive Meaning through Acceptance of the False Truth
II. The Way of Entering the Great Mansion of Definitive Meaning through Acceptance of the Ultimate Truth
   A. How to Practice at the Time of Severing Conceptual Elaborations by the View

B. How to Proceed at the Time of Applying Conventions by Knowledge-Expressions of Āryas

Part Three: Great Ship of Discrimination that Sails into the Ocean of Definitive Meaning

(A Treatise Differentiating the Tenets of Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika Madhyamakas)

I. Brief Presentation
II. Extensive Explanation
  A. How the Prāsangika and Svatāntrika Branches Diverged
  B. The Explanation of the Differences of their Tenets
    1. The Presentation of My Own Tradition
      i. [Explanation of] the Difference [between the Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika Interpretation] of the Reason, (That Which Establishes)
      ii. The Difference between [Their Interpretations of] the Thesis, That Which is Established
      iii. The Difference [between Their Interpretations of] Valid Cognition, That Which Measures
      iv. The Difference [between Their Interpretations of] the Object, That Which is Measured
      v. Temporal Differences [between Their Interpretations of] the View
      vi. Conclusion by Showing the Final Similarity of [Their Understanding of] the View
    2. Refutation of Traditions of Others
      i. Enumeration of Assertions
      ii. Refutation of Inappropriate Aspects

Notes

1. Only Buddha has fearlessness in 1) stating that he has extinguished all his negativities, 2) stating that he has realized everything, 3) pointing out the objects of abandonment and 4) pointing out the path that is their antidote.
2. Munindra, or Buddha Śākyamuni, is likened to the sun. However, although each ordinary sun shines only in each separate universe, the sun of Śākyamuni—the manifestation of the enlightened state of dharmadhātu or the sphere of dharmas—dispels the darkness of negativity of our world of a hundred million universes, each of which contains a Mount Meru in the middle, four continents and so forth.
3. I.e., the moon.
4. The sun is the lord of the twelve signs of the zodiac.
5. These two steps, paying homage and making a promise to compose the text, preclude the main body of most Buddhist treatises.
6. Śākyamuni Buddha took his birth in the royal family of the Śākya clan.
7. The realms above the earth, on the earth and under the earth.
8. "Migrators" are non-liberated individuals migrating from one state of existence to another.
9. The Seventh Karmapa Chodrak Gyamtso.
10. In general, in order for something to be defined, the following three factors are necessary: 1) a defined thing or definiendum (a vase, for example); 2) its definition (the rough definition of a vase is "a bulbous thing that can contain water"), and; 3) the basis on which the definition is given to the definiendum, (for example, golden bulbous thing).
11. Those of eternalism and nihilism.
12. "Internal" does not necessarily mean withdrawing the senses from external objects or practicing inner concentration, since these features are common to Buddhism and to non-Buddhist schools of yoga both. Rather, it means withdrawing the mind from saṃsāra and directing it towards nirvāṇa, which is a feature unique to Buddhism.
13. This refers to twelve synonyms of "individual," such as "self," "person," "sentient being," etc.
14. There are four Buddhist tenets: Vaibhāṣika (School of the Proponents of Particulars), Sautrāntika (School of the Followers of Sūtras), Cittamātra (Mind Only School) and Madhyamaka (Middle Way School). In comparison to the last, which is the highest one, the first three are lower schools.
15. See footnote 171.
16. In many of his Madhyamaka texts, Shakya Chokden mentions that the extreme of nihilism is: first to be established as something by one valid cognition and later to be refuted by another valid cognition. Since most Buddhist tenets do not accept "self of persons" at all, they do not deny

anything existent, but rather prove the absence of something non-existent.

17. Human beings have all the five skandhas, or "groups" of constituents of our being: form, feeling, recognition, compositional factors and consciousness, by virtue of existing in the desire realm, which is one of the three realms. The others are the form realm and the formless realm.
18. With these five reasonings, one tries to find "self" in terms of being one with the skandhas, different from them, having the skandhas, relying on them, or as being that on which the skandhas rely.
19. Here, as well as in many other places in the text, "Buddhists" mean "proponents of Buddhist tenets." One very important feature of Shakya Chokden's views, a feature shared by such philosophers from other schools as Mipham ('ju mi pham – 1846 – 1912), is its assertion that in order to completely realize selflessness of person and then to attain liberation from saṃsāra by accustoming one's mind to that realization, it is enough to rely solely on the scriptures of the Vaibhāṣika school, such as Abhidharmakośa, without resorting to the views of higher schools. In his *"Great Path of Elixir of Immortality" - explanation of profound pacification free from conceptualization (zab zhi spros bral gyi bshad pa stong nyid bdud rtsi'i lam po che)*, Shakya Chokden states: "It is permissible to accept that Śrāvaka schools also have the two views [of selflessness.] There is no need to mention [that this applies also to] the followers of Mahāyāna; if selflessness of person is explained in full completeness even by the scriptures of Vaibhāṣikas, of course it is accepted by Sautrāntikans [as well]. Hence, due to accustoming [one's mind] to the selflessness determined by Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika scriptures, it is possible to see this [selflessness] directly, and by further accustoming [to that direct realization] it is possible to manifest nirvāṇa characterized by abandonment of the seeds of grasping at "self of persons"."This statement has many implications and greatly distinguishes Shakya Chokden's approach from that of Tsongkhapa and other philosophers, whose assertion is that only Madhyamaka, and (in the case of Tsongkhapa, Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka in particular), gives a correct and complete presentation of the selflessness of person. (As for the selflessness of phenomena, all Madhyamikas of Tibet agree that only Madhyamaka scriptures present it completely.)
20. There are four main schools of Hearers or Śrāvakas—Sarvāstivāda, Mahāṁghika, Sthāvira and Saṃmitya, all of which are subdivisions of Vaibhāṣika. The last one, Saṃmitya, has three subschools: Kurukulla, Avantaka and Vatsiputriya. All Saṃmityas accept a "self" as substantially existent. While the Kurukulla and Avantaka subschools accept it as one with the skandhas, the subschool of Vatsiputriya accepts an inexpressible "self" which is neither permanent nor impermanent. Thus, it is neither one with nor different from the skandhas. To be one with the skandhas it would have to be impermanent, to be different

from the skandhas and still exist, it would have to be permanent, since everything existent is either permanent or impermanent.

21. "Śrāvaka schools" here refers to both Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika. These two schools are those of Hīnayāna, or Lower Vehicle, while Cittamātra and Madhyamaka are those of Mahāyāna, or Great Vehicle.
22. The previous explanation was related to the elimination of "self of persons" only. All grasping at "self" is divided into grasping at "self of persons" and "self of phenomena."
23. Generally characterized phenomena are mental images, or actual objects of conceptual mind. These phenomena have never existed from the beginning because conceptual mind is always mistaken, since in its mode of perception it takes conceptual images for the real things they stand for and confuses them. Generally characterized phenomena are opposed to self-characterized phenomena, such as indivisible particles and moments of consciousness. Thus, for these Hīnayāna schools, mere negation of "self" won't be ultimate truth since it is just a conceptual image arising from the refutation of "self." The way āryas (see footnote 30) realize selflessness is by directly seeing self-characterized phenomena. So, for example, while directly perceiving selflessness of person, they will see the self-characterized phenomena of 'mind' free of the idea of a self of persons.
24. This is the explanation given by Sautrāntikans. It is a further addition to the explanation given by Vaibhāṣikans, who accept coarse matter as truthless and the indivisible particles of which it consists as truly existing.
25. They are named thus because they accept the true existence of phenomena that are considered false from a Madhyamaka point of view. These Proponents of Phenomenal Existence are opposed to the Proponents of Entitylessness, but not all Buddhist tenets can be included within these two categories. As will be seen later, the Yogācāra school lies outside these two categories.
26. Roughly speaking, within the threefold division of the path into view, meditation and action, through certain conventional types of meditation or through such conventional types of actions as generosity, one amasses the collection of merit. Meanwhile through such practices of the view, etc., as meditation on selflessness, one amasses the collection of wisdom. Both collections are necessary for the attainment of enlightenment within the Mahāyāna vehicle as well as within the Hīnayāna vehicle.
27. While most scholars of the Snow Land accept that Yogācāra (School of Yoga Practitioners) is synonymous with Cittamātra, Shakya Chokden views it as a subdivision of Madhyamaka. While others divide Cittamātra into two subschools: True Aspectarians and False Aspectarians, Shakya Chokden says that the True Aspectarians' school is identical with Cittamātra, whereas False Aspectarians' school is identical to Yogācāra. In his *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning*

of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya (byams chos lnga'i nges don rab tu gsal ba), Shakya Chokden states: "There is no scriptural statement explaining the False Aspectarians school as Cittamātra, but there is this quote from *Distinguishing between Middle ane Extremes* which shows it as Madhyamaka." His line of reasoning is following: It is correctly accepted that "there is no fifth intent of [Śākya]muni," that is, there is no fifth type of Buddhist tenet. Nevertheless, such Mahāyāna texts as the *Five Dharmas of Maitreya* explain the view in a way different from both Cittamātra and Proponents of Entitylessness. Since those texts themselves call their view "Madhyamaka" and since there is neither scriptural authority nor reasoning which can undermine this statement, they should be considered Madhyamaka.

28. The *Five Dharmas of Maitreya (Pañca Maitreyagrantha)* are: *Ornament of Clear Realizations (Abhisamayālaṁkāra), Ornament of Sūtras (Sūtrālaṁkāra), Distinction between Middle and Extremes (Madhyāntavibhaṅga), Distinction between Phenomena and Reality (Dharmadharmatavibhaṅga)* and *Sublime Continuum (Uttaratantra).* Although in his *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya,* Shakya Chokden refutes this order of their counting, positing instead his own order, nevertheless in this text he uses above given order for the sake of convenience. This order will become important for understanding later discussions in the text.

29. In the fifth chapter of Maitreya's *Distinguishing Between Phenomena and Their Reality* it is said: "Thus, there are no phenomena except dharmadhātu."

    In his *Enjoyment Ocean of the Speech of Seven Treatises (sde bdun ngag gi rol mtsho),* Shakya Chokden states: "In brief, the acceptance of the consciousness which has external appearances arisen from firm potentials as non-mistaken is the way of thinking of deluded worldly [minds]. Acceptance of it as mistaken is the tradition of Cittamātra. Since this [consciousness] is mistaken, it is not suitable for it to be direct cognition. At the same time, [since it is not inferential either, it] cannot be valid cognition [at all]. Thus, Cittamātra's own tradition accepts only two direct cognitions: self-awareness and direct yogic perception. [This is true for Yogācāra as well]. According to True Aspectarians, externally oriented consciousnesses also are non-mistaken with regard to [their] own apprehended aspect. Thus, [these sonsciousnesses are] the direct perception of self-awareness. Then, the difference between True Aspecterians and Sautrāntika comes from the acceptance of external phenomena as engaged object [by the latter] and non-acceptance [of that by the former. ("Apprehended aspect" is the "form" of an object which consciousness takes when it apprehends external (for Sautrāntika) or externally appearing (for Cittamātra and Yogācāra) phenomena. This is contrasted to "apprehending aspect" – subjective "form" of consciousness itself taken by it in the act of perception. "Engaged object" is the object actually reached in the act of perception.)]

According to False Aspectarians, such [externally oriented consciousnesses], similarly to the distorted sense-perception [which sees, for example,] falling hair, are mistaken and thus cannot be direct perception. Because of that, self-awareness is only non-dual primordial mind."

Since for Sautrāntika, the external world is real, there exists externally oriented consciousness which is non-mistaken. Since for Cittamātra and Yogācāra, the external world is unreal, externally oriented consciousness is only mistaken. Nevertheless, the "apprehended aspect" of that consciousness, for example appearance of water for eye consciousness, is real for True Aspectarians, (this is why they are called so). That is, while eye consciousness itself is mistaken with respect to external objects, its aspect of self-awareness (self-awareness being the innate quality of self-cognizing of every mind) is non-mistaken with respect to both that consciousness appearing in the "form" of an object, i.e. "apprehended aspect," and that very consciousness appearing in the "form" of the subject, i.e. "apprehending aspect." For False Aspectarians, that "apprehended aspect" is unreal, like the appearance of the two moons, etc. to the distorted eye consciousness, (this is why they are called False Aspectarioans). Thus a self-awareness of "apprehended aspect" cannot be admitted to, since self-awareness can be only non-mistaken direct perception. Only self-awareness of the "subjective aspect" of consciousness is admitted by them. This is what is called the "(primordial mind of) dharmadhātu", etc.

30. Āryas or "noble beings" are those who directly realize selflessness beginning with the Path of Seeing. (The Path of Seeing is the third of five stages along the path to enlightenment, each of which is referred to as a Path. The five are, in order, the Path of Accumulation, the Path of Preparation, the Path of Seeing, the Path of Meditation and the Path of No Learning.) Here, Shakya Chokden is not suggesting that false phenomena are not destroyed by the act of non-seeing of these phenomena by āryas, say on the path of meditation, absorbed in direct realization of the ultimate truth. Rather, he means that there is nothing to destroy here, since no false phenomena have ever existed.
31. The presentation of the four extremes of existence, non-existence, both and neither is a more detailed explication of the two extremes of existence and non-existence, which are also called the extremes of eternalism and nihilism.
32. As for the meaning of "the middle" in this tradition, Shakya Chokden says in his *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya*: "As a remainder of the negation of all extremes of conceptual elaborations, there is left no thing at all called "the middle." The term "the middle" is a mere label placed on [that nothing], because there can exist no object of knowledge not empty by its own nature."

33. In his *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya*, Shakya Chokden explains that Lesser Madhyamikas are those who eliminate the two extremes from the point of view of selflessness of person only, while Middle and Great Madhyamikas are those who eliminate the two extremes from the point of view of selflessness of phenomena as well. Middle Madhyamikas are those who accept three final vehicles (or paths to enlightenment), while Great Madhyamikas are those who accept only one final vehicle. (As for Hīnayāna, there are two types, vehicle of Śrāvakas, or Hearers, and vehicle of Pratyekabuddhas, or Solitary Realizers. Mahāyāna is known as the Vehicle of Bodhisattvas. By admitting that after the achievement of enlightenment of a low vehicle, such as the Vehicle of Śrāvakas, one doesn't and cannot enter a higher vehicle, such as the Vehicle of Bodhisattvas, one accepts three final vehicles, and vice versa. Madhyamikas admit only one final vehicle.)

    In the auto-commentary on the *Profound Dragon's Roar*, Shakya Chokden gives the following presentation: While it is widely known that Lesser Madhyamikas are those who hold the view of Śrāvaka schools, there are two ways of identifying the Great and Middle Madhyamikas: When Yogācārins identify themselves as Great Madhyamikas, Niḥsvabhāvavādins (see footnote 38) become [for them] Middle Madhyamikas. When Niḥsvabhāvavādins identify themselves as Great Madhyamikas, Yogācārins become Middle Madhyamikas. Nevertheless, according to Shakya Chokden both Yogācāra and Niḥsvabhāvavāda traditions have to be identified as Great Madhyamikas, since their claims to be Great Madhyamikas are equally powerful.

34. Here, as well as in many of Shakya Chokden's other texts, this term usually refers to Tsongkhapa and his followers.
35. I.e. of Buddha, Nāgārjuna, etc.
36. This was pointed out by many of Tsongkhapa's critics: Ju Mipham, Gorampa Sonam Senge, etc.: According to Tsongkhapa, the extreme of being both means being both conventionally non-existent and truly existent. Therefore, not being both will be the negation of these two and this negation entails the affirmation of conventional existence and the lack of true existence. This Tsongkhapa cannot reject. Trying to address this problem, some Gelukpa scholars say that the extreme of not being both means the truly existent negation of being both, whose refutation they accept. But then scholars like Gorampa (see his *Distinguishing the Views – lta ba'i shan 'byed*) point out yet another problem, namely that it won't be possible to eliminate all the four extremes on the basis of one and the same phenomenon. That is, although a given phenomenon can be shown to be free from the first three extremes, nevertheless it will be not this very phenomenon but the third extreme itself which is free from the fourth extreme. To get rid

of this new problem, others say that the meaning of the fourth extreme is "not being both truly non-existent and conventionally existent," but then the fourth extreme will be just the same third extreme explained in negative terms.

37. There are two types of negation: non-affirming negative and affirming negative. For example, if one thinks, 'there is no vase on the table,' one is negating the existence of a vase without positing anything in its place. In this statement, the non-existence of a vase on a table doesn't affirm the existence of that table. This is what is referred to by a non-affirming negative. However, if one says, 'the table is not a vase', it will be an affirming negative. The table being a vase is negated, but the table itself is left in remainder of this negation.

    Although these schools as well refute extremes through non-affirming negation, they also describe the ultimate truth and the path through affirming negation. The remainder of that negation will be indivisible particles and moments of consciousness for the two Śrāvaka tenets, subjective mind for Cittamātra, and non-dual self-awareness for Yogācāra.

38. While most Tibetan scholars divide Madhyamaka into Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika subschools, Shakya Chokden does not accept this division as authentic or based on solid reason. In the *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya*, he states: "In brief, the division of Cittamātra into True Aspectarian and False Aspectarian and the division of Madhyamaka into Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika didn't exist in the classifications of tenets in the Land of Āryas [- India]. It is not seen in scriptural statements and it is also [shown as] defective by reasoning: While divisions of tenets are made from the point of view of *the view*, there is no difference seen between the views of Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika Madhyamakas." Thus, Shakya Chokden's discussions of the difference between Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika schools are ultimately conducted on the basis of the assertions of other scholars, for the sake of convenience. Of course, he accepts the distinction between Prāsaṅgika and Svatāntrika (these two terms being created by Tibetan scholars), but he does not believe there to be a difference between the final views of these two subschools. Rather, he conceives of it as a difference among provisional assertions of the followers of one and the same school. Explaining his own view on the sub-divisions of Madhyamaka, he continues: "Nevertheless, the division of Madhyamaka into the two traditions of the methods of "Emptiness of Oneself" and "Emptiness of Other" is perfectly clarified in the treatises of the Two Great Charioteers [Nāgārjuna and Maitreya]."For Shakya Chokden, the School of Emptiness of Oneself is a synonym for the School of Proponents of Entitylessness (Niḥsvabhāvavāda), while the School of Emptiness of Other is a synonym for the School of Yoga Practitioners (Yogācāra).

39. I.e., the Madhyamaka of the Tantric vehicle.
40. Here, the term 'superimpositions' refers to all misconceptions.
41. This is the Yogācāra approach as well. For Shakya Chokden, Gorampa and others, this is a key point that starkly distinguishes their views from those of Tsongkhapa and his followers. For the latter, ultimate truth is a non-affirming negative. This very negative is first realized conceptually on the Paths of Accumulation and of Preparation, through listening, thinking and conceptual meditation. Later, when enough clarity is acquired, it is realized directly on the Paths of Seeing and so forth. For Shakya Chokden, this is impossible. First of all, only the objects of conceptual minds can be non-affirming negatives. Since they are generally characterized phenomena, such negatives cannot be perceived by direct perception, including yogic direct perception. In his *General Presentation of Valid Cognition: Key of Magic Vajra Mechanism Opening the Doors of Great Treasury of the Seven Treatises [on Valid Cognition] (tshad ma spyi'i rnam bzhag sde bdun bang mdzod chen po'i sgo 'byed 'khrul 'khor gyi lde mig),* Shakya Chokden says: "Even for as much as the tip of a hair, I don't accept direct perception measuring generally characterized phenomena. Otherwise it would follow that this direct perception is conceptual mind." He states that all Madhyamaka reasoning is aimed at ceasing any and all conceptions. It is true that on the conceptual level, one reaches a point of perceiving non-affirming negation of all the four extremes. But this is just 'nominal ultimate truth,' which, from the point of view of a yogi who has directly realized ultimate truth, is nothing more than conventional truth. 'Real ultimate truth' is realized by yogic direct perception only. Exactly the same idea is expressed by Gorampa in his *Distinguishing the Views* and *General Presentation of Madhyamaka: Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning (dbu ma'i spyi don nges don rab gsal).*

    Here arises another problem, which Shakya Chokden addresses in the auto-commentary on his *Profound Dragon's Roar from the Ocean-like Clouds of Definitive Meaning (nges don rgya mtsho sprin gyi 'brug sgra zab mo).* "Then, won't it turn out that one thing has been established by the view and then something different is practiced in meditation? No. The reason is this. After ceasing by the view all masses of conceptual elaborations, when one proceeds to meditation, it is not correct [to accept that] what is experienced by familiarizing mind can be anything else than primordial mind of dharmadhātu itself." Although in direct perception of dharmadhātu one no longer meditates on non-affirming negation of the four extremes, nevertheless one meditates on primordial mind of dharmadhātu, the wisdom of self-awareness, which is by nature free from extremes. Thus, the 'object' (if it can be called such) of this sort of meditation is 'qualified' by that which has been established by the view. For example, when eye consciousness sees the sun free from clouds, it does not see non-affirming negation of clouds. Nevertheless it sees the sun 'qualified' by the absence of clouds.

42. Ultimate bodhicitta is the 'mind of enlightenment' directly realizing ultimate truth.
43. Sugata is a synonym of Buddha.
44. The division of Buddha's teachings into Three Dharmacakras or Three Turnings of the Wheel of Dharma is given in various sūtras, the most famous of which is the *Sūtra Definitely Explaining the Intent (-Saṁdhinirmocanasūtra).*
45. When one looks at *Prajñāpāramita (- Perfection of Wisdom) Sūtras,* one finds lengthy discussions of the emptiness of all phenomena "from form to omniscience," as it is said. These are the explicit teachings on emptiness. But implicitly, these sūtras show the stages of the path, Buddha nature and so forth. For example, saying that the formula 2 x 2 =4 is empty by nature, implicitly one shows that 2 x 2 = 4. These are the teachings of the "hidden meaning."
46. I.e., the approaches explained above in section 3.1.1. The first approach explains ultimate truth as primordial mind endowed with Buddha's qualities, etc. The second approach explains it as freedom from any conceptualization.
47. This refers to emptiness endowed with the most supreme of all aspects, primordial mind of dharmadhātu.
48. Everything existent (as well as non-existent) is either false truth or ultimate truth. For an elaboration of this point, see Shakya Chokden's *Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning.*
49. In the sixth chapter of his *Engaging in the Middle Way (Madhyamakāvatara),* Candrakīrti states: "Ignorance is false since it obscures the nature. That which is artificial and appears as true due to this [ignorance] is false truth, as Muni said..."
50. There are five texts in this collection composed by Nāgārjuna: *Root Wisdom (Prajñāmūla), Sixty Verses on Reasoning (Yuktiśāṣtra), Rebuttal of Objections (Vigravyāvartanī), Seventy Verses on Emptiness (Śūnyatāsaptati)* and *Subtle Grinding (Vaidalyasūtra).*
51. The threefold division of all phenomena into entirely imputed, other-powered and thoroughly established is given in the *Sūtra Definitely Explaining the Intent,* as well as in the *Five Dharmas of Maitreya* and elsewhere. Roughly speaking, entirely imputed phenomena are external matter and such non-existent things as "self", rubbit horns, etc., other-powered phenomena are conventional minds and thoroughly established phenomena are ultimate truth. Their presentation varies from tenet to tenet among Mahāyāna tenets.
52. Hevajra and Cakrasaṁvara are names of particular Tantras, as well as terms describing ultimate truth.
53. This is a prophecy from the *Root Tantra of Mañjuśrī (Mañjuśrīmūlatantra).* The full quote is: "Four hundred years after my nirvāṇa, there will appear a bhikṣu named Nāga trying to benefit this Doctrine. He will accomplish the reasoning called 'peacock'. He will compose many

treatises on the meaning of element and will know the suchness of the meaning of phenomenal non-existence. He will live for six hundred years. Having left the body he will go to Sukhavati [paradise]. Immediately after that he will definitely accomplish buddhahood."

54. Saraha actually was Nāgārjuna's guru and the person from whom he received monastic ordination. When we say that Nāgārjuna pioneered the Madhyamaka tradition, we usually mean pioneering Madhyamaka of Sūtras. But Saraha can be said to have pioneered the Madhyamakas of both Sūtras and Tantras. (Of course, Buddha Śākyamuni was the first to teach the Madhyamaka view. "Pioneering" means here giving an interpretation of Buddha's intent and making that a system of thought by later teachers.)
55. *Doha for the Subjects* from Saraha's *Treasury of Dohas*. (Dohas are the songs of spiritual realization and experience.)
56. In his commentary on Maitreya's *Sublime Continuum*.
57. The "basis of all" (ālaya) is distinguished from the "consciousness – basis of all"(ālayavijñāna). While the latter is the basis of various conventional states of mind and their imprints, the former is the foundation of the whole existence, ultimate as well as conventional.
58. "Clear light" and "luminous" are two translations of one and the same Tibetan word here.
59. Or the natural body of reality (of Buddha).
60. This may refer to those shown by the following verse from the first chapter of *Sublime Continuum*: "Because the body of perfect Buddha emanates, because suchness is inseparable and because the lineage exists, all those with bodies always have Buddha essence."
61. There are two texts in this collection: *Precious Garland (Ratnavalī*) and *Letter to a Friend (Suhṛllekha)*.
62. The third collection called *Collection of Praises* (bstod tshogs) consists of *Praise to Mind Vajra, Praise to* Dharmadhātu, *Praise Pleasing Sentient Beings, Praise to Mother Prajñā*pāramita, *Praise to Three Bodies, Praise as Ultimate, Praise as Having no Examples, Praise as Unthinkable, Praise as Transwordly, Praise as the One Beyond Praises* and *Supreme Praise*. Sometimes two *Praises of Great Stupas* and two *Praises of Mañjuśrī* are added. Lengthy discussions of the number, meaning, etc., of the three collections can be found in Gorampa's *Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning*. (Not all the texts of Nāgārjuna are included in the three collections.)
63. For example, in his *Four Hundred (Chatuḥśatakaśāstrikakārikā)*, he discusses both conventional practices and the view of emptiness at equal length.
64. Āryadeva was a direct disciple of Nāgārjuna.
65. According to Shakya Chokden, Mere Knowing (Vijñānamātra) view is a synonym for Yogācāra view. Thus it is different from the Mind Only (Cittamātra) view. In *"Abbreviated Madhyamaka Essence" – explanation of*

[Nāgārjuna's] "Commentary on Ultimate Bodhicitta" (don dam byang chub sems 'grel gyi bshad pa dbu ma'i snying po bsdus pa)– Shakya Chokden makes the following distinction: "False Aspectarian Yogācāra is not to be called "Cittamātra"[i.e. "Mind Only"], since [it] doesn't accept appearances as mind. [Nevertheless, it has] to be called "Vijñāna[mātra, i.e. "Mere Knowing"] because [it] accepts the entity [i.e. nature] of thoroughly established [phenomena] as knowing, and there is no other thing [which can serve as the nature] of other-powered phenomena."

We should mention, however, that the Yogācāra view which Candrakīrti refutes (see just below) is not identified by Candrakīrti himself as separate from Cittamātra. In the auto-commentary on *Profound Dragon's Roar,* Shakya Chokden states: "When Proponents of Entitylessness give explanations within the framework of Pāramitayāna exclusively, they explain that the Yogācāra's view of temporarily severing superimpositions and {Yogācāra's] way of positing [its] ultimate tenets don't transcend Cittamātra's approach among the four [types of approaches of] the Proponents of [Buddhist] Tenets."

66. Immediately preceding this quote (taken from *Root Wisdom*), Candrakīrti in his *Engaging in the Middle Way* says: "Neither emptiness nor non-emptiness exist even a little. These [terms] are mere explanations on a false level, like that of 'form', etc., which are given because of [the needs of] disciples."
67. The full quote of this verse from Nāgārjuna's *Root Wisdom* is: "Neither from self, nor from other, not from both, not without causes – any phenomenon in any circumstance is never produced."
68. Saṁkhya is one of the Indian non-Buddhist schools that accepts the manifestation of phenomena already existent in potential form in the state of Universal Principle (prākṛti). Thus, it accepts production from self.
69. "Autonomous reason" or "autonomous syllogism" is the reason that produces an inferential understanding not only in the mind of an opponent, but also in the mind of the person who posits the reason. While positing this syllogism, something that the opponent already knows is used as an example. Otherwise, it is impossible for him to realize the pervasion of the proof by the predicate of the probandum, and subsequently, therefore generate an inferential understanding of the combination of the subject and predicate of the probandum. The subject, predicate of the probandum and proof are all indispensable parts of autonomous syllogisms.

    On the other hand, in the type of consequence that aims to show contradictions in an opponent's statements, or merely to bring him to a particular conclusion, the example does not have to be stated. But if consequence is conceived to be the same as autonomous syllogism, it will need an example. Since this example is not stated, the closest thing to use as an example will be the proof itself. But if the proof and example

are identical, this is a fault in syllogism, because pervasion of the predicate by the proof cannot be based on one part of the same pervasion. Instead, it must be based on a phenomenon other than these two, a phenomenon previously known to the opponent. Since the example is missing, correct reason, which has to be based on it, is also missing.

70. According to Svatāntrika, only consequence by itself cannot produce inferential understanding in an opponent's mind. Thus, after showing contradictions in the opponent's statements by the means of consequence, an autonomous syllogism has to be posited. This autonomous syllogism will have the reverse meaning of the consequence, that is, the reversed predicate of statement of the consequence will become the proof of the autonomous syllogism, while the reversed reason of the consequence will become the predicate of the probandum of the autonomous syllogism. For example, if an opponent accepts that sound is permanent but produced, the consequence showing this contradiction will be: "It follows that the subject, sound, is not produced, because it is permanent." An autonomous syllogism, based on this consequence, will be: "The subject, sound, is impermanent, because of being produced. It is like, for example, a sprout." Since the opponent doesn't accept the pervasion of "impermanent" by "being produced," autonomous syllogism won't work for him right away. The consequence prepares him, and when he is ready to accept the pervasion, an autonomous syllogism is used.

    In this case, the consequence, posited by Buddhapālita, would sound like: "It follows that, for the subject—any phenomenon in any circumstance—production is meaningless and limitless, because it is produced from itself." When this is turned into an autonomous syllogism, it becomes: "The subject—any phenomenon in any circumstance—is not produced from itself, because production is not meaningless and not limitless." Since production is thereby accepted in this syllogism, it becomes a phenomenon accepted in the frame of ultimate reasoning. Furthermore, since it is not a production from self, both or neither, but nevertheless is still production, it turns into production from other, which also cannot be accepted at the time of pondering the ultimate.

71. For details see *Great Ship of Discrimination* below.
72. Also known as '*Two Truths*' (bden gnyis) or '*Distinguishing the Two Truths*' *(bden gnyis rnam 'byed)*.
73. The translator Nok Lekpe Sherap (rngog legs pa'i shes rab) was both the uncle and teacher of the Great Translator Nok Loden Sherap. The latter spent seventeen years studying Dharma in Kashmir.
74. Indian logician Dharmakīrti. The first famous Buddhist logician was Dignāga, the author of *Compendium of Valid Cognition (Pramāṇa samuccaya)*, and other works. Dharmakīrti later eliminated misconceptions regarding Dignāga's approach, and clarified and

developed it. The *Commentary on Valid Cognition* is the most famous of his logical works known as the *Seven Pramāṇa Texts (saptapramāṇaśāstra)*, or the *Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition*. They include: the *Commentary on Valid Cognition (Pramāṇavartika)*, *Discernment of Valid Cognition (Pramāṇaviniścaya)*, *Drop of Reasoning on Valid Cognition (Nyāyabindu)*, *Drop of Logical Reasoning (Hetibindu)*, *Analysis of Relationship (Saṃbandhaparikṣā)*, *Establishing Another Continuum (Saṃtanantarasiddhi)* and *Science of Debate (Vadanyāya)*.

75. For details see *Great Ship of Discrimination*.
76. The view of "the emptiness of oneself" accepts that all phenomena are empty of any nature whatsoever, false as well as true. The view of "the emptiness of other" accepts that ultimate phenomena are empty of false nature, while holding that they are not empty of ultimate nature.
77. See *Great Ship of Discrimination*.
78. If the subject, proof and so forth appear to the mind pondering the ultimate, being illusory appearances, they will turn to be illusion established through ultimate reasoning. To avoid this fault, Candrakīrti chose the way of consequence, while later Svatāntrika s explained that all opposites are negated by the ultimate reasoning. When one of a pair of opposites is negated, the other one, being dependent on it, is also automatically negated. Thus later Svatāntrikas finally arrived at the same position as Candrakīrti.
79. Tsongkhapa's interpretation can be found in his *Thorough Clarification of Madhyamika Intent (dbu ma dgogns pa rab gsal)* commentary on *Engaging in the Middle Way (Madhyamakāvatāra)*, in the last chapter of his *Great Stages of the Path (lam rim chen mo)* and other texts.
80. In the *Root Tantra of Mañjuśrī (Mañjuśrīmūlatantra)*.
81. "Treatise" in this case means the word of Buddha himself.
82. Samadhi (concentration) of the Stream of Dharma can be attained beginning with the Path of Accumulation of the Mahāyāna vehicle. In this samadhi, the practitioner actually meets Buddha in one of his manifestations and directly receives Dharma (Buddhist Doctrine) teachings from him.
83. Tuṣitā, or the Heaven of Joy, is one of the six abodes of the gods of the desire realm. The Future Buddha, bodhisattva Maitreya, is presently abiding there.
84. These *Eight Divisions*, or *Eight Prakaranas*, are: *Explanation of the Ornament of Sūtras (Sūtrālamkārabhāṣya)*, *Commentary on Distinction between Middle and Extremes (Madhyāntavibhaṅgatika)*, *Commentary on Distinction between Phenomena and Reality (Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅgavṛtti)*, *Thirty Verses (Triṁśikakārikā)*, *Twenty Verses (Viṁśikakārikā)*, *Division of the Five Skandhas (Pañcaskandhapraknaara)*, *Science of Explanation (Vyākhyayukti)* and *Division of Confirmation of Karma (Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa)*.
85. This is the view of Gelukpa, parts of Sakya (Gorampa, etc.,) and later Nyingma tradition (Mipham, etc). Gelukpa school considers the view

of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* to be that of Svatāntrika and the view of *Sublime Continuum* to be that of Prāsaṅgika . For other scholars (Mipham, Gorampa, etc.,) the view of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* is that of Madhyamaka in general, since they (unlike Gelukpas) accept no difference in either the final view or in the presentation of the stages of the path by Svatāntrika and Prāsaṅgika .

86. That is, Madhyamaka of Yogācāra.
87. The eight clear realizations are: omniscient mind, knowledge of the paths, knowledge of the bases, complete training in all aspects, peak training, serial training, momentary training and Wisdom Truth Body. A separate chapter is devoted to each of these clear realizations. Each clear realization is illustrated by certain number of topics. For example, omniscient mind is illustrated by ten topics: enlightened motivation of bodhicitta, Mahāyāna instructions, etc. Knowledge of the paths is illustrated by eleven topics, knowledge of the bases by nine topics, etc.
88. The first chapter of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* explains that the four levels (Heat, Peak, Forbearance and Supreme Dharma) of the Path of Preparation have respectively the four types of conceptions: nine conceptions of afflicted grasped phenomena, nine conceptions of purified grasped phenomena, nine conceptions of substantional grasping phenomena and nine conceptions of imputed grasping phenomena. The conceptions related to each level are not manifest, whereas the conceptions related to subsequent levels are manifest. In his commentary on the Ornament of Clear Realizations called *Garland of Waves of the Ocean of Approaches (bzhed tshul rgya mtsho'i rlabs kyi phreng ba)* Shakya Chokden explains: "In brief, those four levels of the Path of Preparation gradually undermine four [respective] conceptions. Thus, [the first three of] the four levels of the Path of Preparation have [respectively] three, two and one manifest conceptions which are the objects of abandonment of the path of seeing. The last [level] doesn't have even one [of the four manifest conceptions]. All [of the four levels of the Path of Preparation] indistinguishably have all [the four conceptions] in the sense that they take power [over the conceptions] and [in the sense that they have the] seeds [of those conceptions]." (The four levels take power over these conceptions because they have clear understanding of the emptiness of their nature. They have the seeds or potentials of these conceptions because these conceptions are completely abandoned only by the Path of Seeing, while the Path of Preparation just suppresses them, thus leaving their seeds ungerminated). Further, Shakya Chokden asserts that the explanations of the line, "...has and [thus] relies on the four conceptions," in the famous commentaries of Vimuktasena and Haribhadra have this interpretation as their single intent.
89. In his *Clear Meaning (Sphuṭārthā)* commentary on the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* Haribhadra comments on these lines from the fourth chapter

which explain Mahāyāna application: "Non-abiding in form, etc., since [they] have no essence, and non-application related to them, are application." ("Application" is the second topic illustrating complete training in all aspects.)

90. "Aspects" is the first topic illustrating complete training in all aspects. Haribhadra's *Clear Meaning* says: "Particulars of primordial mind observing impermanence and other [factors] of the nature of reality, which are the antidotes to discordant factors grasping at permanence, etc., are presented as aspects. This is the definition."
91. This is the description of the fourth of the four topics illustrating momentary training, "non-dual momentary training," to which the seventh chapter of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* is devoted. Momentary training is done at the end of the continuity of mind on the Path of a Learning, just the moment before a person becomes a Buddha.
92. The point which Shakya Chokden makes in this discussion is as follows: the objects of practical experience, as well as the objects of abandonment, are described in the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* as mind from the point of view of "the emptiness of other." Without contradicting that description, all phenomena are explained as empty from the point of view of "the emptiness of oneself."
93. Ten Grounds of Mahāyāna are further subdivisions of the Path of Seeing and the Path of Meditation.
94. The Sūtras of Perfect Differentiation are those sūtras of the Third Turning of the Wheel of Dharma which differentiate "the three entities" or three types of phenomena, and use this differentiation to explain other sūtras from the point of view of Yogācāra.
95. Many other scholars accept that Yogācāra Madhyamaka is a subdivision of Svatāntrika, the full name of which is Yogācāra Svatāntrika Madhyamaka. In this view, ultimate truth is presented from the point of view of Svatāntrika, while conventional truth is presented from the point of view of Cittamātra. (As we saw, Shakya Chokden does not accept it. For him Yogācāra Madhyamaka and Yogācāra are synonyms. Svatāntrika is subdivision of Proponents of Entitylessness). Gelukpas also share the former approach. According to Tsongkhapa, one of the uncommon features of Prāsaṅgika is the non-acceptance of apperception even on conventional level. It is generally accepted that Svatāntrika, Cittamātra and Sautrāntika accept apperception, whereas the assertion that Prāsaṅgika as the only true Proponent of Entitylessness is a distinguishing assertion of Tsongkhapa's Gelukpa School. Thus, the Buddhist schools that accept apperception (and also the Vaibhāṣika School which does not accept apperception) are Proponents of Phenomenal Existence. (As was mentioned in footnote 29, apperception or self-knowing is the aspect of every mind's self-cognizing. For example, while one part of an eye consciousness sees form, another perceives eye-consciousness itself.)

96. Madhyamaka of Sūtras.
97. Looking at this quote, one might expect that the Hevajra Tantra shows the view of emptiness of self as higher than the view of emptiness of other. Also, it may look that based upon the reasoning related to the first view, it is possible to negate true existence and any nature of primordial mind as well, thus destroying the view of Proponents of Emptiness of Other. Shakya Chokden provides an excellent answer to this in his *Enjoyment Ocean of the Speech of Seven Treatises*: "Reasoning given by Nāgārjuna negates non-dual primordial mind as existent in the framework of that reasoning. But in general, the existence [of that primordial mind] is not negated because it is beyond being an object of sounds and concepts, and because it is experienced by primordial mind of self-awareness only." Then, answering the question as to why the Madhyamaka of Proponents of Entitylessness was placed in the interval between Yogācāra and Tantra, Shakya Chokden continues: "[It is done] in order to stop conceptions grasping at extremes of existence, non-existence, etc. regarding that holy meaning[,i.e. non-dual primordial mind]. As master Chandrakīrti stated: "The repulsion of concepts is accepted by scholars to be the result of analysis"."
98. The meaning of this quote from Vajragarbha's commentary on the *Condensation of the Hevajra Tantra (Hevajraiṇḍārthaṭīkā)* is as follows: There are just three buddhahoods – those of Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas and Buddhas. There are only four tenets – those of Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Cittamātra and Madhyamaka. Thus, Vajragarbha's assertion would be contradicted if Madhyamaka, as identified by Asaṅga, was the fifth tenet.
99. Thus, what is expressed by the word "middle" in the title of *Distinction between Middle and Extremes* and in such passages in the text itself as "...that is the Middle Way," etc., would not refer to Madhyamaka tenets. But such an assertion is wrong from Shakya Chokden's point of view: Maitreya didn't teach a view higher than the one expressed in *Distinction between Middle and Extremes*. Moreover, he designated it by the name 'Madhyamaka' and not 'Cittamātra' or any other name. This view is not undermined either by reasoning or scriptural authority. Why then, Shakya Chokden would say, can it not be the case that the view of *Maitreya's Five Dharmas* is a real Madhyamaka view and nothing else?
100. In his auto-commentary on *Engaging in the Middle Way*, Candrakīrti says: "If one asks whether the Sthavira Vasubandhu, Dignāga, Dharmapāla and other authors of treatises of the past also completely abandoned these non-mistaken teachings on the meaning of dependent origination, having been frightened by the mere sound [of Madhyamaka being taught], I will say, 'Yes'." (Sthavira is a title bestowed on the elder in monastic community.
101. Thus, Shakya Chokden points out that Asaṅga and Vasubandhu on the one hand and Candrakīrti on the other call themselves

Madhyamikas. Furthermore, each faction refuted the views held by the other. Additionally, there is no either valid reasoning or scriptural authority which can refute their statements. Thus, despite the fact that these two views differ, they are equally qualified to be called Madhyamaka views. (Discussed here are the views of their tenets, not the views of meditative equipoise which, according to Shakya Chokdèn, rather complement each other.)

102. There are two stages of practice of Anūttarayogatantra or Highest Yoga Tantra (the highest of the four classes of Tantra): Generation Stage which emphasizes such conventional practices as visualization of divine mandalas, etc., and Completion Stage which emphasizes contemplation on the ultimate reality as it is explained in Tantra only. (The four classes of Tantra are: Krīya (Action), Chārya (Performance), Yoga and Anūttarayoga Tantras).
103. According to Tsongkhapa, there is no difference between sūtric and tantric explanations of the object, emptiness. But there is a difference with respect to the subject. In Anūttarayogatantra, the uncommon subject realizing that emptiness is great bliss; this sort of awareness is not discussed in sūtras. Tsongkhapa doesn't identify this subject as the ultimate truth since, according to him, it is mind, while the ultimate truth is always a non-affirming negative.
104. The Bodhisattvas' commentaries are three commentaries written by ārya bodhisattvas. They are: the commentary on the *Kālacakra Tantra* by Puṇḍarīka called *Stainless Light (Vimalaprabhā)*, the commentary on the *Cakrasaṃvara Tantra* by Candrabhadra usually called *Vajrapāṇi's Upper Commentary* (because in it Candrabhadra, a manifestation of Vajrapāṇi, commented on the upper, or beginning, part of the *Cakrasaṃvara*), and the commentary on the *Hevajra Tantra* by Vajragarbha usually called *Vajragarbha's Commentary*.
105. Depending on context, "empowerment" can refer to the basis of the path, the path and its result. Here it refers to the four empowerments (and especially the fourth) which are the necessary prerequisites for entering the path of Anūttarayogatantra. The fourth empowerment called Precious Word Empowerment is the most important, because it shows the unique view of Anūttarayogatantra. The first three – Vase, Secret and Wisdom-jñāna Empowerments – prepare a disciple for the fourth. Of course, this is not their only function: Vase Empowerment prepares a disciple for the practice of the Generation Stage, while the last three prepare a disciple for the practice of the Completion Stage.
106. Vehicle of Sūtras, sūtric teachings.
107. This is the last moment of the continuum of mind on the Path of Learning [i.e., the first four Paths], the moment before one becomes a Buddha, thus attaining the Path of no Learning.
108. Sakya Pandita, interlinear auto-commentary on *Thorough Distinction of the Three Types of Vows (sdom pa gsum rab tu dbye ba)*. The complete passage

from which Shakya Chokden quotes is as follows: " If there were a view superior to the Pāramita[yāna's view of] freedom from extremes, that view (of the pinnacle of the Nine Vehicles) would be conceptualized. If [this tantric view] is [also the view of] freedom from conceptual elaborations, there is no difference [between sūtric and tantric views]. So, the view of (wisdom produced from) listening, understood through explanation, is the same. Nevertheless Secret Mantra is superior in the method of (direct realization) of freedom from conceptual elaborations." The words of the commentary are enclosed in round brackets.

109. The full quote is: "Although the meaning is the same, there is no delusion, there are many methods and no hardships [in the practice of Tantra, compared to Sūtra. Also, Tantra is taught] for the sake of individuals with sharp capacities. Thus, Mantrayāna is superior."

110. This terminology arises in connection with discussions of the two stages of meditative equipoise of the Path of Meditation, for example. The first of these, the "uninterrupted path," is the direct antidote of respective objects of abandonment. It is qualified by the process of their abandonment. The second, the "path of liberation," is qualified by freedom from those objects when they have been abandoned. The last moment of the path at the end of the continuum belongs to the first category.

It appears that Shakya Chokden thinks that practitioners of an exclusively sūtric path can attain a buddhahood equal to the tantric buddhahood, while still asserting that the tantric means and the emptiness (or ultimate truth) which is realized through that, are superior to those of the sūtric path. Therefore, similarly to the tantric path, on the level of sūtras also there are no obscurations which cannot be uprooted by the uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum. In the auto-commentary on his *Profound Dragon's Roar from the Ocean-like Clouds of Definitive Meaning* Shakya Chokden objects those opponents who state that Sakya tradition holds that without relying on tantric skillful means, it is not possible to realize emptiness on the path of exclusuvely Sūtric Vehicle. He says: "It contradicts [the fact that] those Noble Lords [i.e. Sakya Supreme Masters] accept [that it is possible to] fully complete the ten stages by [following] the path of Pāramiayāna alone." (Implicit, but not stated, Shakya Chokden agrees with this view of Supreme Sakya Masters.)

111. Perfect limit is the ultimate truth, natural nirvāṇa. Its complete manifestation means attainment of Buddhahood. According to the sūtra teachings, this is possible only after completion of a very long (taking thousands of lifetimes) process of accumulation of positive qualities, bringing disciples to ripening and preparing Buddhafields for future enlightenment (called respectively "accomplishment, maturing and training"). Attainment of nirvāṇa qualified by mere freedom from cyclic existence (which does not require initial "accomplishment," etc.,) is

manifesting perfect limit at the wrong time from the point of view of sūtric Mahāyāna. The practice of Tantrayana can take just one lifetime to attain Buddhahood (or the manifestation of perfect limit). Since, according to sūtras, only nihilistic nirvāṇa (like that of the Hīnayāna) can be attained in such short time, such attainment would indicate the fault that pure limit had been manifest at the wrong time.

112. "Methods of accomplishment" are manuals of tantric practice.
113. Pāramitas or "perfections" are such fully developed positive qualities as generosity, morality, etc. Pāramitayāna or the Vehicle of Pāramitas is synonymous with the Vehicle of Sūtras or the Vehicle of Reasoning, sūtric teachings.
114. "Spiritual friend" means "spiritual teacher," not a friend of a particular person.
115. Frequently, while translating personal names I don't split the name into the actual original name of a person and the name of the land, clan, etc., from which he came. In many cases, the last part of the name becomes an indispensable part of the original name. For example: Dromtonpa, Sakya Pandita, Shan Junne Yeshe, etc.
116. According to Buddhist logic, a correct syllogism must have three modes: property of the subject, forward pervasion and counter pervasion. For example, in the syllogism 'the subject, a pen, is existent, because of being matter', the property of the subject is 'matter'; the forward pervasion is 'whatever is matter it has to be existent'; and counter pervasion is 'whatever is not existent it is not matter'.
117. Shambhala's Dharma language is the teachings of the *Kālacakra Tantra*. Soon after these teachings appeared in India, they were taken to and disseminated in the Nothern Land of Shambhala. Together with its commentaries, written by Shambhala kings, the *Kālacakra Tantra* was later translated into Tibetan.
118. This is the name of an Indian scholar as it is known in Tibet.
119. Dre Sherap Bar was born in the second half of the eleventh century.
120. The Translator Nok went to India when he was eighteen and stayed there for seventeen years. He came back to Tibet in 1092.
121. Abhidharma (Supreme Knowlege) teachings come from the *Abhidharmasūtra* and other sūtras. The most famous Abhidharma commentaries are the *Compendium of Knowledge (Abhidharmasamuccaya)* by Asaṅga and the *Treasury of Knowlege* (*Abhidharmakośa)* by Vasubandhu. They are called respectively the *Higher and Lower Abhidharmas.*
122. The Kadam tradition originated from Atīśa and his disciples, Dromtonpa, etc. Subsequently, Gelukpas accepted various features of this approach and called their tradition New Kadam. The original Kadam tradition was eventually subsumed by the other traditions. At present, there are only four main traditions of Tibetan Buddhism: Nyingma, Sakya, Kagyu and Geluk.

123. Ar Janchup Yeshe was born at the end of the eleventh century.
124. "Kashipa" (bka' bzhi pa) literally means "The One Learned in Four Words." In earlier times, this degree used to be given to scholars learned in Madhyamaka, Abhidharma, Prajñāpāramita and Vinaya.
125. The teachings for those who practice Mahāyāna Path are grouped within Bodhisattvapitaka (literally the Basket [Containing the Teachings] for Bodhisattvas).
126. According to the *Golden Rosary of Kagyu (bka' brgyud gser 'phreng)*, written by the Second Shamarpa Khacho Wanpo (zhwa dmar pa mkha spyod dbang po – 1350 – 1405), Dusum Khyenpa was ordained at the age of sixteen by Choggi Lama and was given the name Chokyi Drakpa (chos kyi grags pa).
127. Composed in 1346 by Tsalpa Kunga Dorje (tshal pa kun dga rdo rje), *Hulen Annals (hu len deb gter)* is also known as the *Red Annals (deb ther dmar po)* .
128. Mahāmudrā or Great Seal is the synonym of the absolute reality.
129. The definition of space is mere 'negation of obstructions.' This is also a non-affirming negative. Thus, emptiness, which is a mere negation of extremes, is similar to space because it is also a non-affirming negative.
130. This quote, which can be found in the fifth chapter of the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* and the first chapter of the *Sublime Continuum*, is actually a citation from a sūtra.
131. There are two types of thoroughly established phenomena: unchangeable and incontrovertible. Since the first of these is "objective" ultimate truth, it is treated in different ways depending on the approach to the ultimate truth in general. The second type (incontrovertible thoroughly established phenomena) is the wisdom realizing the first (unchangeable thoroughly established phenomena).
132. According to the Nyingma tradition, Krīya, Cārya and Yoga Tantras are classified as Outer Tantras, while the three subdivisions of Anūttarayogatantra – Mahāyoga, Anuyoga and Atiyoga – are classified as Inner Tantras.
133. Padmasambhava, as well as Śāntarakṣita, were invited to Tibet by the Dharma king Trison Deutsen.
134. There are two types of siddhis, or accomplishments: ordinary (like flying in the sky) and extraordinary (like attainment of Buddhahood).
135. The Nyingma tradition classifies all of Buddha's teachings into the Nine Vehicles. The first three (Śrāvakayāna, Pratyekabuddhayāna and Bodhisattvayāna) belong to sūtric teachings. The last six (three outer and three inner classes of Tantras) belong to tantric teachings. The view of Atiyoga surpasses all the other views of sūtric and tantric Madhyamaka.
136. These instructions, given by Māhasiddha Virūpa, are based on the teachings of the Hevajra Tantra.

137. These instructions are based on the teachings of the *Guhyasa*māja Tantra. Nāgārjuna wrote a treatise on them called the *Five Stages (Pañcakrama).*
138. In this context the Six Dharmas refers to the Six Dharmas of Naropa (Tib.: nā ro chos drug). They are instructions based on the teachings of the *Chakrasamvara, Hevajra and Guhyasamaja Tantras.*
139. The fifth chapter of the *Sublime Continuum* says: "There is nobody in the world more knowlegable than the Victor [Buddha]: Only the Omniscient One and nobody else knows correctly the supreme suchness of everything. So, don't create confusion regarding sūtras given by the Sage [Buddha] himself. Otherwise you will destroy the method of [Śākya]muni, and the holy Dharma also will be harmed."
140. So, have a look at it!
141. Azadirachta Indica.
142. Brahmadrama, Indian mulberry tree.
143. Interpretations of "the three entities" differ depending not only on the class of tenets (Cittamātra, Madhyamaka and its subdivisions) explaining them, but also depending on the school (Geluk, Sakya etc.,) commenting on those interpretations. For example, throughout all his *Essence of Perfect Explanation of Interpretive and Definitive (drang nges legs bshad snying po)* Tsongkhapa argues that the ultimate truth is a non-affirming negative from the point of view of all Mahāyāna tenets. Thus, according to him, real thoroughly established phenomena can only be non-affirming negations of substantial difference between objects and subjects according to Cittamātra tenets. For him, the sūtras of the Third Dharmacakra only teach the Cittamātra view. According to Shakya Chokden, they teach the Yogācāra view which is to be contrasted with the view of Cittamātra. Thoroughly established phenomena are only naturally pure non-dual primordial mind. The other two of "the three entities" are also interpreted differently.
144. The quote is from the end of the concluding chapter of *Engaging in the Middle Way*. In his auto-commentary, Chandra comments on these lines: "Let scholars be certain of the following: In the same way as this Dharma, called "emptiness," is not expressed correctly in treatises other than [the *Root] Madhyamaka* treatise [of Nāgārjuna], so, that which originates from this tradition, which we explained here with the answers to objections, does not exist in other treatises, just like the Dharma of emptiness."
145. According to Tsongkhapa, the object of negation of Madhyamaka reasoning has to be a non-existent thing, such as "true existence." According to him, valid cognition based on correct reasoning cannot negate some existent phenomenon. Otherwise either the cognition would be wrong or the phenomenon would be non-existent. (The two types of phenomena are established by the two types of valid cognition; ultimate phenomena are established by ultimate valid cognition, while conventional phenomena are established by conventional valid

cognition. These two cognitions cannot contradict each other; they have different objects.) Tsongkhapa states that the basis of emptiness upon which this negation is made has to be an existent phenomenon, since no innate mind grasping at true existence will grasp at true existence of something non-existent, like the son of a barren women, and innate grasping at true existence is the main thing to abandon in order to attain liberation.

In contrast, as can be seen in his *Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning* and other texts, Shakya Chokden approaches the two truths, existence and non-existence, valid and non-valid cognitions, etc., in dependance upon the relative perspectives. For example, a vase is an ultimate truth for the worldly mind and false truth for āryas who have directly realized ultimate truth. Also, when the reasoning refuting the imputations of worldly mind is emphasized, a vase would be non-existent and its emptiness of true existence would be existent and ultimate. But when the reasoning refuting the imputations of a yogi's mind is emphasized, this type of ultimate truth would be conventional truth. Thus, according to Shakya Chokden, the basis of emptiness does not necessarily have to be existent, and the object of negation of Madhyamaka reasoning does not necessarily have to be non-existent. Both of them can be existent from a certain conventional perspective, and both of them can be non-existent from the point of view of the ultimate reality.

Furthermore, according to Tsongkhapa, everything that exists has to exist conventionally (i.e., falsely) since nothing exists truly. For Shakya Chokden it is the opposite: if something exists falsely, it has to be non-existent. Only ultimate truth exists because it exists truly. (Of course, when temporarily the visions of wordly minds are accepted as valid, conventional phenomena are accepted as existent).

Thus, we can say that Shakya Chokden's approach concerns "levels" or "points of view" from which the respective observers perceive things. For Tsongkhapa, phenomena are either conventional or ultimate truths irrespective of whether they are perceived by an ārya or an ordinary person. The two truths depend on each other, but ultimate mind does not undermine the conventional and isn't concerned with its objects. For example, an eye consciousness isn't concerned with sound which is the object of an ear consciousness.

146. Various parts of *Engaging in the Middle Way*, in which from the point of view of Shakya Chokden (as well as Gorampa, etc.,) Candra refutes Mere Knowing (Vijñānamātra) tenets, are interpreted by Tsongkhapa as refutation of Bhāvaviveka.
147. According to Shakya Chokden, in realization of the emptiness of emptiness the concept of emptiness itself has to be refuted, while for Tsongkhapa only grasping at the true existence of emptiness has to be refuted. This approach is wrong from Shakya Chokden's point of view.
148. In the self-commentary on *Engaging in the Middle Way* Candra states that although emptiness is taught in Hīnayāna scriptures, it is not taught

there fully, completely and extensively. According to Shakya Chokden, because of these and other reasons Hīnayāna followers cannot have complete realization of selflessness of phenomena. Nevertheless, according to Tsongkhapa there is no difference between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna āryas' realization of emptiness.

149. Also see *Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning*.
150. *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and *Abhidharmakośa* respectively.
151. I.e. non-Buddhists and Buddhists respectively.
152. Nevertheless Tsongkhapa interprets 'private syllogism' as 'syllogism established by its own characteristics' which, according to him, Bhāvya accepts but Candra doesn't accept since for the latter it is the synonym with 'truly existent syllogism' (and any type of true existence is negated by Proponents of Entitylessness).
153. At the end of his *Clear Words* Candra gives the list of Nāgārjuna's and other texts which he used in the composition, and continues: "... [I also] saw the commentary composed by Buddhapālita, [learned] that which was well explained by Bhāvaviveka – [all these teachings] coming one after another, and [used] that which I got through my own discrimination [as well]. Having put them together I presented [the teachings] correctly in order to please individuals of great intelligence."
154. There are two types of cognition – direct and conceptual. The first one is 'affirmative engager' because it simply reflects its objects as they appear to it [if it is valid]. The second one is 'eliminative engager' because it perceives its objects through elimination of other objects. A direct object of this second type of perception is a so called 'isolate' or 'elimination of other' because while conceiving its object, say, a conceptual image of a pot, it mentally isolates it from all the other objects, say, cars and pens, and mentally eliminates them. Direct perception cannot do it, thus the isolate cannot become its direct object. Also see footnote 41.
155. In presentation of sixteen types of emptiness in the sixth chapter of *Engaging in the Middle Way*.
156. There are two types of otherpowered phenomena: pure and impure. An example of the first is those otherpowered phenomena which can serve as the path to liberation. An example of the second is those otherpowered phenomena which cannot do it. There are also two types of entirely imputed phenomena: entirely imputed phenomena lacking identity (which even temporarily are not accepted as existent, like, say, rabbit horns and Tibetan computers) and nominal entirely imputed phenomena (like, for example, external matter).
157. 24th chapter of *Root Wisdom* begins with the objections: "If all of them were empty, there would be no origination, no disintegration, and it would follow that for you there are no the four noble truths," etc.
158. In the 24th chapter the answer to that objection begins with: "Explanation of Dharma by Buddhas is based on two truths: the false truth of saṃsāra and the truth of holy meaning...,"etc.

159. On the level of conventional presentation, when false truth is emphasized, it is not correct to use ultimate reasoning. Shakya Chokden mentions this debate in order to show that the idea behind it is not to prove conventional existence (like Tsongkhapa does) but to explain that there are two levels of presentation and it is not correct to refute one when another is emphasized.
160. There are various ways of counting the Five Bodies. One of them is: the Wisdom Body of Reality, the Natural Body, the Unchangeable Vajra Body, the Body of Perfect Utility and the Emanation Body.
161. Mañjuśrī, Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāṇi are Buddhas in the forms of Bodhisattvas representing respectively enlightened wisdom, compassion and power.
162. The crown is the place where the Chakra of Great Bliss is located.
163. As it is mentioned by the author at the beginning, the composition of this text was requested by [Karmapa,] the lord of enlightened activities of the Supreme Victor [Buddha]. He is the Seventh Karmapa, Chodrak Gyamtso..
164. An epithet of the god Vishnu whose ten manifestations are known as fish, tortoise, boar, etc.
165. Inner oceans are located between the mount Meru and the four continents which surround it.
166. Rāhu is the demon who has only a huge head, not a body. He once swallowed the sun. In mythology it is said that he keeps swallowing the sun during solar eclipses.
167. According to legends the sun is carried on a chariot in the sky.
168. A water lily which opens at the appearance of the moon.
169. 'Candra' is the name of both the moon and Candrakīrti.
170. See footnote 49.
171. As inhabitants of the desire realm, we have six types of consciousness: five sensual and one mental. The first five are eye, ear, nose, tongue and body consciousnesses. These can never be conceptual. Mental consciousness is of two types: conceptual and non-conceptual. Both conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses can be either valid or wrong consciousnesses. Non-mistaken non-conceptual consciousness is direct perception. The respective objects of the five sense consciousnesses are: forms, sounds, smells, tastes and tactile objects. Direct objects of conceptual mental consciousness are various conceptual images. While direct perception simply reflects its objects like a mirror, conceptual mind apprehends its objects in various ways, called 'modes of apprehension,' which are either concordant or discordant with what is accepted to be reality. For example, if someone conceptually apprehends a text of Shakya Chokden as a text of Shakya Chokden, his mode of apprehension will be correct. But if he or she apprehends it as a tale of Mickey Mouse, his or her mode of apprehension will be wrong. What an object is apprehended to be through the mode of apprehension

is called 'an object of the mode of apprehension.' In the case of direct perception, it is like a "reflection" of its grasped object, but in the case of conceptual mind it differs depending on the mode of apprehension. Everybody agrees that in such superimpositions as Creator God, etc., made by wrong tenets (which are called 'immediate causes of mistake'), the mode of apprehension is wrong and its objects are called 'wrong false truth'. But what is unique to Shakya Chokden's approach is that for him the mode of apprehension by innate types of self-grasping is correct from the point of view of the world, and thus all its objects (such as 'mere I,' 'truly established I,' etc.,) are correct false truth. Likewise, innate self-grasping won't be a wrong mind from the point of view of the world, according to his view. Innate types of mind are those to which individuals have been accustomed during beginningless lifetimes, as opposed to the minds deceived by immediate causes.

172. I.e. direct cognition of ultimate truth.
173. These two are actually synonyms, the idea behind it being that what is accepted by worldly mind is accepted by it as true and ultimate. That which is not accepted by wordly mind as true is not accepted at all. Shakya Chokden discusses this question here in order to avoid an assumption that something can be accepted as truth but not ultimate truth by worldly mind (as well as by āryas, since the latter accept false truth for the sake of beneficial communication with the world, not from their own point of view).
174. This is the view of Tsongkhapa.
175. There are two types of ultimate truth: real and concordant (with real ultimate truth). Concordant ultimate truth is conceptual images created through partial negation of concepts. Real ultimate truth is free from any concepts.
176. Here refers to Madhyamaka reasoning.
177. That is they can be conceptually conceived and expressed by words. Real ultimate truth is unthinkable and non-expressible. The fact that the term 'ultimate truth' is used does not mean that ultimate truth is expressed. What is expressed is just a conceptual idea, but this idea does not have a corresponding object which can be reached either through conceptual thinking or through direct perception by worldly mind.
178. The goddess of wisdom and learning.
179. Six ornaments beautifying Jambudvipa (the Southern Continent, one of the four continents surrounding Meru, where we live, according to Buddhist cosmology) are the Indian Buddhist masters: Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Dignāga and Dharmakīrti. Here the four charioteers of Madhyamaka [of Proponents of Entitylessness] are Śāntideva, Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti.
180. Method of the Proponents of Entitylessnes.
181. Nāgārjuna's *Root Wisdom*.

182. Consequences refuting production from self, other, both and causeless production.
183. See 2.1.1. The four autonomous syllogisms mentioned here are subdivisions of the syllogism of vajra fragments (see footnote 186).
184. "Prāsaṅgika " means (the School of) the Advocates of Consequence. "Svatāntrika" means (the School of) the Advocates of Autonomous (or Private) Syllogism.
185. Inferential cognition produced by autonomous syllogism.
186. These five are called "five great Madhyamaka syllogisms" (dbu ma'i gtan tshigs chen po lnga). The syllogism of separation from one and many analyses the nature of phenomena in general. For example: 'The subject, all phenomena like sprouts, etc., do not truly exist, because they don't exist as either truly one or truly many.'

    The syllogism of vajra fragments analyses causes. For example: 'The subject, things like vases, are not truly produced, because they are not produced from self, not truly produced from other, not produced from both and not produced from neither.'

    The syllogism negating production as existent and non-existent analyses results. For example: 'The subject, computer, doesn't exist truly, because it is not produced as existent, non-existent, both existent and non-existent, or neither existent nor non-existent at the time of its cause.

    The syllogism negating production in four ways analyses both causes and results. For example: 'The subject, phenomena, don't truly exist, because one cause doesn't truly produce one result, one cause doesn't truly produce many results, many causes don't truly produce one result, and many causes don't truly produce many results.'

    The syllogism of dependent existence is the king of reasoning which establishes the truthlessness of everything. For example: 'The subject, Shakya Chokden, is not truly established, because he is dependently existent.'
187. See footnote 116.
188. As seen in 2.1.3, Prāsaṅgika accepts four types of valid cognition on the level of general presentation of phenomena (from the point of view of the two truths, etc.), and Candrakīrti discusses it in his *Clear Words*. But this presentation doesn't show the unique view of Prāsaṅgika. Engaging in the Middle Way states: "If the word[ly mind] is valid cognition, then, since [it means that] it sees suchness, what need will there be for other [perceptions of] āryas and what will be the use of the Path of Āryas?,"etc.
189. Here "inferential cognition" means the reasoning which produces this cognition. As is seen from the example below, this reasoning is presented as the syllogism of vajra fragments. But since on the level of ultimate analysis autonomous reasoning is not accepted by Prāsaṅgikans, this reasoning is the one which is known to (or accepted by) others only. (Thus all the five reasons accepted as autonomous by Svatāntrika can be included in this category.)

190. As seen from the example, these contradictions (in acceptance of production on the one hand and acceptance of self-production on the other hand) are revealed by showing that if it were true, then, say, seed would never stop its production (if something existent was produced from itself once, why can it be not produced from itself twice, thrice, etc.?), and thus a sprout, result of a seed, would have no chance to be produced (results cannot come before production of their causes is finished).
191. The property of any consequence is to use an opponent's statements as the reasons or at least to use reasons similar to an opponent's statements. Thus reasoning equal to that of an opponent is used. Nevertheless, here this feature is very prominent, and this is why such a name is given. The opponent accepts that production of one thing from another is possible because they are different (and one precedes another). Then it would follow that darkness could be caused by fire immediately preceding it, etc.
192. To prove the possibility of perception without the existence of external phenomena, Cittamātra uses the example of a dream. It says that the mind which sees the dream is real, but dream visions are not real. Likewise, visions of colors by a blind person are not seen by an eye consciousness based on an eye organ. Rather, they are visions of mental consciousness. Using this example, Cittamātra tries to prove true existence of certain mental phenomena, while refuting the existence of external phenomena. Prāsaṅgika says that since phenomena are only dependently existent, the existence of a subject depends on the existence of an object. Thus, if an object is false, its subject is also false. To perceive something, there have to be an object, subject (mind) and (mental or physical) organ. If one of these three is false, the other two are also false. In the same way as form seen in a dream is false form, the mind that sees it is a false eye consciousness, and the organ on which this perception is based is a false eye organ. Neither objects nor subjects of dreams are real. Thus, the proof given by Cittamātra is yet to be established. In this way it is similar to the thesis it tries to prove.
193. All four quotes are from the sixth chapter of *Engaging in the Middle Way*.
194. When a thesis is a part of a correct syllogism, it is called probandum of a correct syllogism. Otherwise it is a mere thesis (or statement).
195. Svatāntrika also accepts the last two types of valid cognition, but puts them into the category of inferential valid cognition. Valid cognition through an analogy realizes the similarity of one thing to another on the basis of a previous realization of one of these things. For example, if one had seen a mouse but not a rat, then later on, having seen a rat one would be able to think: a rat was similar to a mouse, because it has a similar shape, similar nasty eyes, terrible smell, etc. Valid cognition based on scriptural authority realizes its objects using valid scriptural statements as reasons.

196. See 2.2. of *Drop of Nectar*.
197. In his *Treatise Ascertaining the Mode of Positing the Two Truths (bden pa gnyis kyi bzhag tshul rnam par nges pa'i bstan bcos)* Shakya Chokden explains: "Previously there appeared two traditions in the Madhyamaka Which Accepts Illusion as Established by Reasoning. One accepts non-affirming negative, as established by [Madhyamaka] reasoning, as the "ultimate truth", because [it views it as] the actual object to be proved[,i.e. probandum] by the proof [of Madhyamaka syllogism. The other tradition, viewing] the object to be proved by the proof as mere convention, [accepts as] the "ultimate truth" that which is apprehended by the mind ascertaining the property of the subject [of syllogism]. In later times [there also were scholars who] accepted it. Aśvaghoṣa refuted this [approach of the Madhyamaka Which Accepts Illusion as Established by Reasoning] in *the Stages of Meditation on Ultimate Bodhicitta* (Tib.: *don dam byang chub kyi sems bsgom pa'i rim pa*). [Also,] the Great Translator [Nok Loden Sherap] established with the use of scriptural quotations that the statement 'selflessness is the ultimate truth' is not [accepted by] the scriptural tradition of Madhyamaka Svatāntrika. The Madhyamaka of Thorough non-Abiding states that any object to be proved by a proof is false truth, because it doesn't transcend being a mere negation of [only] one set of conceptual elaborations. Thus, it doesn't exist. Also, [because of its non-existence,] the object to be negated doesn't exist. Then [the question arises:] "Does Madhyamaka of Thorough non-Abiding accept emptiness free from all conceptual elaborations as the ultimate truth?" [The answer:] "How can freedom from conceptual elaborations exist when all conceptions have been destroyed?"" (I.e. negation of something cannot exist when that something doesn't exist.)
198. This is the approach of Tsongkhapa.
199. Expression "from form till omniscience" means "all phenomena."
200. This reasoning and the one below are structured as consequences with subjects, pervasions, etc.
201. Tsongkhapa actually accepts that from Prāsaṅgika point of view (which for him is the only correct one) Svatāntrika accepts true existence (although it doesn't admit it) because it accepts phenomena being established by their own characteristics, while for Prāsaṅgika this establishment and true establishment are synonyms. According to Tsongkhapa, 'own characteristics' accepted by Candrakīrti are just conventional features of phenomena, while he does not accept on either the ultimate or the conventional level 'own characteristics' which are the objects of negation of Madhyamaka reasonings.

    Shakya Chokden is aware of this, and what he along with other critics of Tsongkhapa is trying to prove is: 1) there is no specific object of negation by Madhyamaka reasoning, such as 'own characteristics', which Svatāntrika accepts but Prāsaṅgika does not accept; 2) on the

one hand it is not correct to say that Svatāntrika accepts true existence because it accepts 'own characteristics' on the conventional level. On the other hand it is not correct to say that Prāsaṅgika does not accept 'own charcteristics' on the conventional level because it does not accept true existence; 3) 'own characteristics' (= 'true existence') are not some non-existent properties fancied to exist in phenomena established by valid cognition. Rather, the real objects of negation of Madhyamaka reasoning are phenomena and their own features themselves. As it was seen from *the Drop of Nectar*, all conventional (or 'false') phenomena including their own characteristics are equal in being existent on the conventional level and equal in not being existent on the ultimate level.

202. "Seated-just-once" is a person who took a vow to (sit to) eat only once a day.

Glossary

abiding in a mutually exclusive way - phan tshun spang te gnas pa
acceptance - khas len
action - spyod pa
Adherents of Entitylessness - ngo bo nyid med pa ba
adventitious phenomena - glo bur ba'i chos
affirmative engager – sgrub 'jug
affirming negative/affirming negation - ma yin dgag
Anūttarayogatantra - rnal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud
analysis - rnam par brtags pa
appearance - snang ba
apperception - rang rig
application - sbyor ba
apprehended aspect - gzung rnam
apprehending aspect - 'dzin rnam
ārya's conventions - 'phags pa rnams kyi tha snyad
ārya - 'phags pa
aspect - rnam pa
authentic words - lung
autonomous - rang rgyud kyi
autonomous example - rang rgyud kyi dpe
autonomous syllogism/autonomous reason - rang rgyud kyi gtan tshigs
autonomous thesis - rang rgyud kyi dam bca
awareness of primordial mind - rig pa ye shes
basis (of the Path) - gzhi
basis of all - kun gzhi
basis of definition - mtshan gzhi
basis of dependence - ltos sa
basis of emptiness - stong gzhi
being - yin pa
Body of Perfect Utility - long spyod rdzogs pa'i sku
Buddha's qualities - sang rgyas kyi yon tan
Buddha essence - sang rgyas kyi snying po
buddhahood - sangs rgyas nyid
Cārya Tantra – spyod rgyud
causal tantra – rgyu'i rgyud
causeless production – rgyu med pa las skye ba
Cittamātra – sems tsam pa
clear light – 'od gsal

clear realizations – mngon par rtogs pa
clinging mind – zhen blo
collection of merit – bsod nams kyi tshogs
collection of wisdom – ye shes kyi tshogs
complete training in all aspects – rnam rdzogs sbyor ba
Completion Stage – rdzog pa'i rim pa
compositional collection – 'du byed kyi tshogs
compositional factors – 'du byed
compounded phenomena – 'dus byas
conceptions of afflicted grasped phenomena – nyon mongs gzung rtog
conceptions of grasped and grasper – gzung ba dang 'dzin pa'i rnam par rtog pa
conceptions of imputed grasping phenomena – btags 'dzin rtog pa
conceptions of purified grasped phenomena – rnam byang gzung rtog
conceptions of substantional grasping phenomena – rdzas 'dzin rtog pa
conceptual elaborations /conceptualization – spros pa
conceptual elaborations grasping at truth – bden 'dzin gyi spros pa
conceptual elaborations grasping at truthlessness – bden med kyi spros pa
conceptual mind/conceptions – rtog pa
concordant causes – rgyu mthun
concordant ultimate (truth) – mthun pa'i don dam (bden pa)
consciousness – rnam shes
consciousness - basis of all – kun gzhi'i rnam shes
consciousness deceived by an immediate cause (of mistake) – 'phral gyi 'khrul rgyus
consequence – thal 'gyur
consequence revealing contradictions – 'gal ba brjod pa'i thal 'gyur
conventional truth of the world – 'jig rten gyi tha snyad bden pa
conventional phenomena – kun rdzob pa'i chos
conventional truth – tha snyad bden pa/kun rdzob bden pa
conventional valid cognition – tha snyad kyi tshad ma
conventionally existent – tha snyad du yod pa
conventionally non-existent – tha snyad du med pa
conventions – tha snyad
correct appearances – yang dag par snang ba
correct false (truth) – yan dag pa'i kun rdzob (bden pa)
correct reason – rtags yang dag
counter pervasion – ldog khyab
definiendum – mtshon bya
definition – mtshan nyid

definitive meaning – nges don
delusion – rmongs pa
dependent existence – rten 'brel
dependent phenomenon – bltos chos
dependently established – ltos grub
desire realm – 'dod khams
Dharma king – chos rgyal
Dharma language – chos skad
Dharma liable to objections – rtsod ldan gyi chos
Dharmacakra – chos 'khor
dharmadhātu – chos dbyings
dialectical tradition – mtshan nyid kyi lugs
direct (valid) cognition/direct (valid) perception – mngon sum (tshad ma)
direct object – dngos yul
direct yogic perception – rnal 'byor mngon sum
discordant factors – mi mthun pa'i phyogs
divine mandalas – lha'i dkyil 'khor
element – khams
element of both sentient beings and Buddhas – sems can dang sangs rgyas gnyis ka'i khams
element of Sugata's essence – khams bde bar gshegs pa'i snying po
elimination of other – gzhan sel
eliminative engager – sel 'jug
Emanation Body – sprul sku
empowerment – dbang
emptiness endowed with the most supreme of all aspects – rnam pa kun gyi mchog dan ldan pa'i stong pa nyid
emptiness in which skandhas are severed – phung po rnam bcad kyi stong pa nyid
emptiness of matter – bems po'i stong pa nyid
emptiness of oneself – rang stong
emptiness of other – gzhan stong
emptiness of substantional difference of grasped and grasper – gzung 'dzin rdzas gzhan gyis stong pa
emptiness of true existence – bden stong
emptiness related to searching for and not finding terminologically imputed meanings – tha snyad kyi btags don btsal bas ma rnyed pa'i stong pa nyid
emptiness related to severing superimpositions by listening and thinking – thos bsam gyis sgro 'dogs bcad pa'i stong pa nyid

emptiness which is beyond objects of mind – blo yi yul las 'das pa'i stong pa nyid
emptiness which is non-affirming negative – med par dgag pa'i stong pa nyid
emptiness with the essence of compassion – stong nyid snying rje'i snying po can
empty of one's own nature – rang gi ngo bos stong pa
engaged object – 'jug yul
enlightened activities – 'phrin las
enlightenment – byang chub
entirely imputed (phenomena) – kun brtags
entirely imputed phenomenon lacking identity – mtshan nyid yongs su chad pa'i kun brtags
entity – ngo bo (nyid)
equalizing by similar reasons – rgyu mtshan mtshung pa'i mgo snyoms
essence – snying po
established by nature – rang bzhin gyis grub pa
established by valid cognition – tshad mas grub pa
establishment – grub pa
establishment by one's own characteristics – rang gyi mtshan nyid kyis grub pa
example – dpe
exist conventionally – tha snyad du yod pa
existence-as-true – bden yod
explicit teachings – dngos bstan
external objects – phyi rol gyi don
extreme of (being) both – gnyis ka yin pa'i mtha'
extreme of (being) neither – gnyis ka min pa'i mtha'
extreme of (conventional) non-existence – (tha snad du) med pa'i mtha'
extreme of (true) existence – (don dam du) yod pa'i mtha'
extreme of eternalism – rtag mtha'
extreme of nihilism – chad mtha'
extremes of conceptualization – spros pa'i mtha
extremes of objectivity and subjectivity – bzung ba dang 'dzin pa'i mtha'
extremists – mu stegs pa
false [truth] of yogis – rnal 'byor gyi kun rdzob
False Aspectatrians – rnam rdzun pa
false phenomena – kun rdzob pa'i chos

false truth – kun rdzob bden pa
false truth of the world – 'jig rten gyi kun rdzob bden pa
feeling – tshor ba
final definitive meaning – mthar thug pa'i nges don
final vehicle – mthar thug gi theg pa
Five Bodies – sku lnga
five great Madhyamaka syllogisms – dbu ma'i gtan tshigs chen po lnga
five skandhas – phung po lnga
Forbearance – bzhod pa
form – gzugs
form realm – gzugs khams
formless realm – gzugs med khams
forward pervasion – rjes khyab
four extremes – mtha' bzhi
four extremes of conceptualization – spros pa'i mtha' bzhi
four fearlessnesses – mi 'jigs pa rnam pa bzhi
four levels of the Path of Preparation – sbyor lam bzhi
four noble truths – 'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi
four tenets – grub mtha' bzhi
frame of (ultimate) reasoning – (don dam dpyod pa'i) rigs ngo
freedom from (conceptual) elaborations – spros bral
Geluk – dge lugs
generally characterized phenomena – spyi mtshan
Generation Stage – bskyed pa'i rim pa
grasped – gzung ba
grasped object – gzung yul
grasper – 'dzin pa
grasping at signs – mtshan 'dzin
grasping at things – dngos 'dzin
great bliss – bde ba chen po
great compassion – snying rje chen po
Great Madhyamikas – dbu ma chen po
Great Perfection – rdzogs pa chen po
Hīnayāna – theg dman
Heat – drod
heretic – mu stegs pa
hidden meaning of the eight clear realizations – sbas don gyi mngon par rtogs pa
holy meaning – dam pa'i don
I – nga
ignorance – ma rig pa

illusion established through [ultimate] reasoning – sgyu ma rigs grub
illusory appearances – sgyu ma'i snang ba
immediate cause of mistake – 'phral gyi 'khrul rgyu
impermanence – mi rtag pa
impure other-powered phenomena – ma dag pa'i gzhan dbang
imputations of wordly minds – 'jig rten gyi blos btags pa
imputations of yogis minds – rnal 'byor pa'i blos btags pa
imputedly existent – btags yod
incontrovertible thoroughly established phenomena – phyin ci ma log pa'i yongs grub
individual – skyes bu
indivisible moments of consciousness – shes pa skad cig cha med
indivisible particles – rdul phran cha med
inferential (valid) cognition – rjes dpag (tshad ma)
inferential cognition known to others – gzhan la grags pa'i rjes dpag
inferential understanding – rjes dpag
innate "I"-grasping - ngar 'dzin lhan skyes
innate grasping at true existence – bden 'dzin lhan skyes
innate ignorance – lhan cig skyes pa'i ma rig pa
innate mind – blo lhan skyes
innate mind grasping at signs – mtshan mar 'dzin pa'i blo lhan skyes
innate self-grasping – bdag 'dzin lhan skyes
Inner Tantras – nang pa'i rgyud sde
insiders – nang pa
interpretive meaning – drang don
isolate – ldog pa
jñāna – ye shes
Kadam – bka' gdams
Kagyu – bka' brgyud
kindness – brtse ba
knowables – shes bya
knowledge of the bases – gzhi shes
knowledge of the paths – lam shes
knowledge-expressions of āryas – 'phags pa'i shes brjod
known in the world – 'jig rten na grags pa
Krīya Tantra – bya rgyud
lack of true existence – bden par med pa
Lesser Madhyamikas – dbu ma chung ngu
liberation – thar ba
luminous – 'od gsal ba
luminous by nature - rang bzhin gyis 'od gsal ba

Madhyamaka – dbu ma
Madhyamaka of Thorough non-Abiding – rab tu mi gnas pa'i dbu ma pa
Madhyamaka reasoning – dbu ma'i rigs pa
Madhyamaka Which Accepts Illusion as Established by Reasoning – sgyu ma rigs sgrub tu 'dod pa'i dbu ma pa
Madhyamika – dbu ma pa
Mahāyāna – theg chen
Mantrayāna – sngags kyi theg pa
meditation – sgom pa
meditative tradition – sgom lugs
meditetive equipoise – mnyam bzhag
mere I – nga tsam
mere knowing – rnam par rig pa tsam
methods of accomplishment – sgrub thabs
Middle Madhyamikas – dbu ma 'bring po
Middle Path/Middle Way – dbu ma'i lam
Middle Way School – dbu ma pa
migrators – 'gro ba
mind – sems/blo
mind only – sems tsam
Mind Only School – sems tsam pa
mind-vajra free from conceptual analysis – ma prtags pa'i sems kyi rdo rje
mistaken mental consciousness – ye shes 'khrul ba
mistaken sense consciousness – dbang shes 'khrul ba
mode of abiding – gnas tshul
mode of apprehension – 'dzin stang
momentary training – skad cig ma'i sbyor ba
mutually eliminating contradiction – phan tshun spangs 'gal
Natural Body – ngo bo nyid sku
natural dharmakaya – rang bzhin chos sku
natural purity – rang bzhin rnam dag
naturally pure primordial mind – rang bzhin rnam dag gi ye shes
nature – rang bzhin
negative/negation – dgag pa
Niḥsvabhāvavādins – ngo bo nyid med par smra ba
nihilism – med mtha'/chad mtha'
nihilistic emptiness – chad pa'i stong pa nyid
nihilistic nirvāṇa – chad pa'i myang 'das
Nine Vehicles – theg pa (rim pa) dgu

nirvāṇa - myang 'das
nominal entirely imputed (phenomena) – rnam grangs pa'i kun brtags
nominal ultimate (truth) – rnam grangs pa'i don dam (bden pa)
non-affirming negative – med dgag
non-conceptual consciousness – rtog med kyi shes pa
non-deceiving – mi slu ba
non-dual – gnyis su med pa
non-dual primordial mind – gnyis su med pa'i ye shes
non-establishment due to the similarity of the proof and thesis – sgrub byed sgrub bya dang mtshungs pa'i ma grub pa
non-existence-as-true – bden med
non-mistaken consciousness – ma 'khrul ba'i shes pa
non-observing compassion – dmigs pa med pa'i snying rje
non-valid cognition – tshad min gyi blo
Nyingma – rnying ma
object – yul
object of (meditative) experience – nyams su myong bya
object of conceptualization – rtog pa'i yul
object of function of self-aware primordial mind – so so rang rig pa'i spyod yul
object of negation – dgag bya
object of the mode of apprehension – 'dzin stangs kyi yul
objective – yul gyi
objective phenomena – gzung ba'i chos
objective things – gzung ba'i dngos po
objective ultimate truth – yul gyi don dam bden pa
objects of (expressive) sounds and concepts – rjod byed kyi sgra dang rtog pa'i yul
objects of abandonment – spang bya
objects of knowledge – shes bya
obscuration(s) – sgrib pa
omniscience – rnam mkhyen
omniscient mind – rnam mkhyen
one to be experienced by wisdom produced from meditation – sgom pa las byung ba'i shes rab kyi nyams su myong bya
oneness of knowledge and knowable – shes pa dang shes bya gcig pa
opponent – phyi rgol
opposite – 'gal ba
ordinary being – so so skye bo
other-powered (phenomena) – gzhan dbang
Outer Tantras – phyi'i rgyud sde

outsiders – phyi rol pa
overestimation – sgro 'dogs
overextended emptiness – thal byung gi stong pa nyid
Paramitayāna – phar phyin theg pa
path – lam
Path of Accumulation – tshogs lam
Path of Learning – slob lam
path of liberation – rnam grol lam
Path of Meditation – sgom lam
Path of No Learning – mi slob lam
Path of Preparation – sbyor lam
Path of Seeing – mthong lam
Peak – rtse mo
peak training – rtse mo'i sbyor ba
perfect limit – yang dag pa'i mtha'
permanence – rtag pa
person – gang zag
pervasion – khyab pa
phenomenal non-existence – dngos po med pa
potentials of nirvāṇa – myang ngan las 'das pa'i phyogs kyi bag chags
Prāsaṅgika / Prāsaṅgikans – thal 'gyur ba
Pratyekabuddhas – rang sang rgyas
Precious Word Empowerment – tshig dbang rin po che
predicate of probandum – bsgrub bya'i chos
predisposition for ignorance – ma rig pa'i bag chags
primordial mind – ye shes
primordial mind at the end of continuity – rgyun mtha'i ye shes
primordial mind free from dualism of grasped and grasper – gzung 'dzin gnyis su med pa'i ye shes
primordial mind free from grasped and grasper – gzung 'dzin dang bral ba'i ye shes
primordial mind of dharmadāhtu – chos kyi dbyings kyi ye shes
primordial mind of self-awareness – so so rang rig pa'i ye shes
private syllogism – rang rgyud kyi gtan tshigs
probandum – bsgrub bya
production by nature – rang bzhin gyis skye ba
production from both – gnyis las skye ba
production from four extremes – mtha' bzhi'i skye ba
production from other – gzhan las skye ba
production from self – bdag las skye ba
profound view – zab mo'i lta ba

proof – gtan tshigs/rtags
property of the subject – phyogs chos
proponent – snga rgol
proponent of eternalism – rtag par smra ba
proponent of nihilism – chad par smra ba
Proponents of Buddhist Tenets – nang pa'i grub mtha' smra ba
Proponents of Emptiness of Other – gzhan stong du smra ba
Proponents of Entitylessness – ngo bo nyid med par smra ba
Proponents of Phenomenal Existence – dngos por smra ba
real ultimate (truth) – rnam grangs ma yin pa'i don dam (bden pa)/ don dam (pa'i bden pa) mtshan nyid pa
realization of objective emptiness by subjective great bliss – yul can bde ba chen pos yul stong pa nyid rtogs pa
reason – gtan tshigs
reasoning – rigs pa
reasoning of āryas – 'phags pa'i rigs pa
recognition – 'du shes
remainder – shul
result – 'bras bu
Resultant Buddha Ground – 'bras bu sangs rgyas kyi sa
sūtra – mdo (sde)
Sūtrayāna – mdo'i theg pa
saṃsāra – 'khor ba
saṃsāric potentials – 'khor ba'i bag chags
Sakya – sa skya
Sautrāntika/ Sautrāntikans – mdo sde pa
scriptural authority – lung
seated-just-once – stan gcig pa
Secret Empowerment – gsang dbang
seeds of obscurations – sgrib pa'i sa bon
self – bdag
self of persons – gang zag gi bdag
self of phenomena – chos kyi bdag
self which is the basis of karma and its results – las 'bras kyi rten du gyur ba'i bdag
self-awareness – rang rig
self-characterized phenomena – rang mtshan
self-luminous self-awareness – rang rig rang gsal
selflessness – bdag med
sence consciousness – dbang po'i shes pa
sentient being – sems can

serial training – mthar gyis sbyor ba
seventy topics – don bdun cu
simultaneously born primordial mind – lhan cig skyes pa'i ye shes
six ornaments – rgyan drug
skandhas – phung po
smell – dri
sound – sgra
source – byings
sphere - dbyings
sphere of dharmas – chos dbyings
spiritual friend – dge ba'i bshes gnyen
Śrāvakas – nyan thos
stained mind – dri ma dang bcas pa'i sems
statement – dam bca'
subject – yul can/chos can
subjective things – 'dzin pa'i dngos po
subjective ultimate truth – yul can gyi don dam
sublime phenomena – bla na med pa'i chos
subsequent attainment – rjes thob
substance – rdzas
substantially existent – rdzas yod
suchness – de kho na nyid
sugata essence – bde gshegs snying po
superimposition(s) – sgro 'dogs
Supreme Dharma – chos mchog
Supreme Secret Mantra – gsang sngags bla na med
Svatāntrika – rang rgyud pa
syllogism negating production in four ways – mu bzhi skye 'gog gi gtan tshigs
syllogism of dependent existence – rten 'brel gyi gtan tshigs
syllogism of negating production as existent and non-existent – yod med skye 'gog gi gtan tshigs
syllogism of separation from one and many – gcig tu bral gyi gtan tshigs
syllogism of vajra fragments – rdo rje gzegs ma'i gtan tshigs
tactile objects – reg bya
tantra – rgyud
taste – ro
ten grounds – sa bcu
tenets – grub mtha'
thesis – bsgrub bya/dam bca'

thinking – bsam pa
Thorough non-Abiding of Severed Continuity – rgyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa
Thorough non-Abiding of Union – zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa
thoroughly established (phenomena) – yongs grub
three-moded syllogism – tshul gsum pa can gyi rtags
topic – don
total non-abiding – rab tu mi gnas
True Aspectarians – rnam bden pa
truly established – bden grub
truly existing /truly existent – bden par yod pa
truly non-existent – bden par med pa
truth – bden pa
truthless(ness) – bden par med pa
twelve creating individuals – byed pa'i skyes bu bcu gnyis
two extremes – mtha gnyis
two truths – bden pa gnyis
ultimate (truth) – don dam (bden pa)
ultimate and conventional objects of knowledge – ji lta ji snyed pa'i shes bya
ultimate meaning – dam pa'i don
ultimate phenomena – don dam pa'i chos
ultimate reasoning – don dam dpyod pa'i rigs pa
ultimate truth from the point of view of the world – 'jig rten nyid la ltos pa'i don dam bden pa
ultimate truth of āryas – 'phags pa rnams kyi don dam bden pa
ultimate truth of worldly ones - 'jig rten gyi don dam bden pa
ultimate valid cognition – don dam tshad ma
unchangeable thoroughly established phenomena – 'gyur med yongs grub
Unchangeable Vajra Body – 'gyur med rdo rje sku
underestimation – skur 'debs
uninterrupted path – bar chad med lam
union – zung 'jug
union of bliss and emptiness – bde stong zung 'jug
union of calm abiding and special insight – zhi lhag zung 'brel
Vaibhāṣika/ Vaibhāṣikans – bye brag smra ba
vajra of ultimate bodhicitta – don dam byang chub sems kyi rdo rje
Vajrayāna - rdo rje theg pa
valid cognition – tshad ma
valid cognition based on scriptural authority – lung tshad ma

valid cognition by the power of things – dngos po stobs zhugs kyi tshad ma
valid cognition measuring the ultimate – don dam 'jal ba'i tshad ma
valid cognition through an analogy – dpe nyer 'jal gyi tshad ma
Vase Empowerment – bum dbang
Vehicle of Reasoning – mtshan nyid theg pa
view – lta ba
virtuous qualities – yon tan
Wisdom Body of Reality/Wisdom Truth Body – ye shes chos sku
Wisdom- Jñāna Empowerment – shes rab ye shes kyi dbang
worldly conventions – 'jig rten gyi grags pa
wrong appearances – log par snang ba
wrong false truth – log pa'i kun rdzob bden pa
wrong mind/wrong consciousness – log shes
wrong truth from the point of view of the world – 'jig rten nyid la ltos pa'i kun rdzob bden pa
wrong views – log lta
Yogācāra – rnal 'byor spyod pa
Yogācārin – rnal 'byor spyod pa ba
yoga of union of calm abiding and special insight – zhi lhag zung 'brel gyi rnal 'byor
Yoga Tantra – rnal 'byor rgyud
yogic direct perception – rnal 'byor mngon sum

Bibliography

Candrakīrti. *Engaging in the Middle Way (Madhyamakāvatara, dbu ma la 'jug pa)*. D.Tg. dbu ma,No.3861.

——.*Clear Words (Prasannapadā, tshig gsal)*. D.Tg. dbu ma, No.3860.

Dharmakīrti. *Commentary on Valid Cognition (Pramāṇavartikakārikā, tshad ma rnam'grel)*. D.Tg. Tshad ma, No.4210.

Dhongthog Rinpoche (gdong thog rin po che). *History of the Sa-skya-pa Sect of Tibetan Buddhism. (sa skya'i chos'byung)*. T.G. Dhongthog Rinpoche, Delhi, India. 1977.

Gorampa Sonam Senge (go ram pa bsod nams seng ge). *Distinguishing the Views – Moonlight of Essentials of Supreme Vehicle (lta ba'i shan 'byed theg mchog gnad kyi zla zer)*. Collected Works, vol.5. Yashodhara Publications. 1995.

——.*General Presentation of Madhyamaka - Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning (dbu ma'i spyi don nges don rab gsal)*. Collected Works, vol.5. Yashodhara Publications. 1995.

Haribhadra. *Clear Meaning (Sphuṭārthā, 'grel ba don gsal)*. D.Tg. Sher phyin, No.3793.

Jamyan Kyentse Wanpo ('jam dbyangs mkhyen brtse'i dbang po). *Selected Works (gsung rtsom gces sgrig)*. Sherab Gyaltsen. Jayyed Press. Delhi, India, 1992.

Khacho Wanpo (mkha' spyod dbang po). *Golden Rosary of Kagyu. (bka' brgyud gser phreng)*. Gangtok, Sikkim, 1978.

Maitreya. *Distinction between Middle and Extremes (Madhyāntavibhaṅga, dbu dang mtha' rnam par 'byed pa)*. D.Tg. Sems tsam, No.4021.

Distinction between Phenomena and Reality (Dharmadharmatavibhaṅga, chos dang chos nyid rnam par 'byed pa). D.Tg. Sems tsam, No.4023.

——.*Ornament of Clear Realizations (Abhisamayālaṁkāra, mngon rtogs rgyan)*. D.Tg. Sems tsam, No.4022.

——.*Ornament of Sūtras (Sūtrālaṁkāra, mdo sde rgyan)*. D.Tg. Sems tsam, No.4020.

——.*Sublime Continuum (Uttaratantra, rgyud bla ma)*. D.Tg. Sems tsam, No.4024.

Nāgārjuna. *Root [Text] of Madhyamaka in Stanzas, Called "Wisdom" (Prajñānāmamūlamadhyamakakārikā, dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig leur byas pa shes rab ces bya ba)*. D.Tg. dbu ma, No.3824.

Sakya Pandita Kunga Gyaltsen (sa skya paṇḍita kun dga' rgyal mtshan). *Interlinear auto-commentary on Thorough Distinction of the*

Three Types of Vows (sdom gsum rab tu dbye ba'i rang mchan). Published under the name *"Explanatory Annotations to Sa-skya-Paṇḍita 's Sdom gsum rab dbye*. Ngawang Topgyal. Delhi, India, 1987.

——.*Auto-Commentary on the Treasure of Reasoning on Valid Cognition (tshad ma rigs gter rang 'grel)*. The complete works of the Great Masters of the Sa sKya Sect. Vol.5. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko. 1968.

——.*Treasure of Reasoning on Valid Cognition (tshad ma rigs gter)*. The complete works of the Great Masters of the Sa sKya Sect. Vol.5. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko. 1968.

Shakya Chokden (shākya mchog ldan). *"The Appearance of the Sun Which Pleases All Discriminative Ones" - a discourse on origination of traditions of the chariots of the Sūtra of Valid Cognition with [its] commentaries (tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnams ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gtam du bya ba nyin mor byed pa'i snang bas dpyod ldan mtha' dag dga' bar byed pa)*. Collected Works, vol.19. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*"Great Path of Elixir of Immortality" – explanation of profound pacification free from conceptualization (zab zhi spros bral gyi bshad pa stong nyid bdud rtsi'i lam po che)*. Collected Works, vol.4. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*Thorough Clarification of Definitive Meaning of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya (byams chos lnga'i nges don rab tu gsal ba)*. Collected Works, vol.11. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*General Presentation of Valid Cognition: Key of Magic Vajra Mechanism Opening the Doors of Great Treasury of the Seven Treatises [on Valid Cognition] (tshad ma spyi'i rnam bzhag sde bdun bang mdzod chen po'i sgo 'byed 'khrul 'khor gyi lde mig)*. Collected Works, vol.19. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*"Falling of Nectar Rain" – extensive [auto-]commentary on Profound Dragon's Roar from the Ocean-like Clouds of Definitive Meaning (nges don rgya mtsho sprin gyi 'brug sgra zab mo'i rgyas 'grel bdud rtsi'i char 'bebs)*. Collected Works, vol.2. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*Garland of Waves of the Ocean of Approaches (bzhed tshul rgya mtsho'i rlabs kyi phreng ba)*. Collected Works, vol.11. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——.*Treatise Ascertaining the Mode of Positing the Two Truths (bden pa gnyis kyi bzhag tshul rnam par nges pa'i bstan bcos)*. Collected Works, vol.13. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——. *"Abbreviated Madhyamaka Essence" – explanation of [Nāgārjuna's] "Commentary on Ultimate Bodhicitta" (don dam byang chub sems 'grel gyi bshad pa dbu ma'i snying po bsdus pa)*. Collected Works, vol.7. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

——. *"Enjoyment Ocean of the Speech of Seven Treatises" – commentary on the Treasure of Reasoning on Valid Cognition (tshad ma rigs pa'i rnam bshad sde bdun ngag gi rol mtsho)*. Collected Works, vol.19. Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyey, 1975.

Tsongkhapa (tsong kha pa). *"Thorough Clarification of Madhyamaka Intent" – extensive commentary on Engaging in the Middle Way (dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal)*. Banaras. Pleasure of Elegant Saying Press, 1973.

——. *Great Stages of the Path to Enlightenment (byang chub lam rim chen mo)*. Dharamsala. Shes rig par khang, 1991.

——. *Essence of Perfect Explanation of Interpretive and Definitive (drang nges legs bshad snying po)*. Banaras. Pleasure of Elegant Saying Press, 1973.

THREE TEXTS ON MADHYAMAKA

Madhyamaka Philosophy of Shakya Chokden (gSer-mdog pan-chen sha-kya mchog-ldan) 1428-1507, translated by Komarovski Iaroslav includes three major treatises on Madhyamaka philosophy.

i. The Wish-fulfilling Meru: A Discourse Explaining the Origination of Madhyamaka (dBu-ma'i byung-tshul rnam-par bshad-pa'i gtam yid-bzhin lhun-po),
ii. Drop of Nectar of Definitive Meaning: Entering the Gate to the Essential points of the Two Truth (bDen-pa gnyis-kyi gnas-la 'jug-pa nges-don bdud-rtsi thigs-pa), and
iii. Great Ship of Discrimination that sails into the Ocean of definitive meaning: A Treatise Differentiating the Tenets of Prasañgika and Svatântrika Madhyamaka (dBu-ma thal-rang gi grub-mtha'i rnam-par dbye-ba'i bstan-bcos nges-don gyi rgya-mtshor 'jug-pa'i rnam-dpyod kyi gru-chen).

The Wish-fulfilling Meru attempts in presenting in a lucid and concise way the Madhyamaka view including the Tantrik-madhyamaka, and its spread in India and Tibet. Drop of Definitive Meaning, through its brief yet succinct explanation guides us in entering the spheres of definitive meaning by means of understanding the two truth- the conventional truth and the ultimate truth. Great Ship of Discrimination that sails into the Ocean of definitive meaning extensively explains the divergence of Madhyamaka into Svatântrika and Prasañgika Madhyamaka, their philosophical views, and their interpretation of various concepts. In all, this anthology gives a general presentation of Madhyamaka schools and their views according to the great Sakyapa master.

ISBN: 81-86470-26-3 Rs: 180